

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 9160. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 9161. A bill to amend the Panama Canal Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey:

H. R. 9162. A bill to provide for the construction of five vessels for the Coast Guard designed for ice-breaking and assistance work; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 9163. A bill to amend chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the processing tax on certain oils imported from the Philippine Islands or other possessions of the United States, so as to provide uniform treatment for Guam, American Samoa, and the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 9164. A bill relating to the acquisition of foreign silver by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 502. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief in certain drought-stricken areas of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 447. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit to the House of Representatives a report relative to a survey of the possibilities and prerequisites of the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. Res. 448. Resolution to provide for an investigation of the Civil Service Commission and its activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 449. Resolution directing the Secretary of War to provide certain information concerning the coast defenses of southern California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 9165. A bill for the relief of John Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 9166. A bill granting a pension to Sarah C. Freeland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KITCHENS:

H. R. 9167. A bill for the relief of Ben H. Thomason; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWE:

H. R. 9168. A bill for the relief of Ellison McCurry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 9169. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jane Vanskiver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LELAND M. FORD:

H. R. 9170. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Sick; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7250. By Mr. McANDREWS: Petition of the racing homing-pigeon fanciers and friends of Chicago, Ill., supporting House bill 7813; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7251. By Mr. HART: Petition of the New Jersey Press Association, opposing the Patman chain-store bill as menacing to free business enterprise and destructive of chain stores whose natural development has been to the benefit of consumers and producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7252. Also, petition of the New Jersey Audubon Society, Newark, N. J., favoring the adoption of the plan of flood control for the Passaic River Valley which contemplates a dry detention dam being constructed at Two Bridges and which would not result in permanently flooding any of the Passaic River bottom lands above Two Bridges; to the Committee on Flood Control.

7253. Also, petition of the Associated General Contractors of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J., opposing the use of Work Projects Administration funds and Work Projects Administration labor on Federal-aid highway projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7254. Also, petition of the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, Newark, N. J., favoring the passage of the amendments to the National Labor Relations Act sponsored by the American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

7255. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of Harrison White, of Indianapolis, Ind., relating to the fiscal policy of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7256. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of residents of El Paso, Tex., urging passage of the Neely block-booking bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7257. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of L. Litman, president, and Sara Durham, secretary, Townsend Club, No. 1, Moundville, W. Va., lamenting the passing of the late Senator William Edgar Borah, of Idaho; to the Committee on Memorials.

7258. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Welfare Federation of America, Inc., State of Florida, Congressional District No. 1, asking that the Seventy-sixth Congress enact the improved General Welfare Act (H. R. 5620); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7259. Also, petition of the American Student Union, University of California Chapter, making certain demands regarding the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7260. Also, petition of the American Communications Association, Local 31, supporting Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7261. Also, petition of the Polish Community Home, Binghamton, N. Y., with respect to aid and relief from America for the suffering, needy, and starving people of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7262. Also, petition of the International Workers Order, Branch 939, asking for the discontinuance of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

7263. Also, petition of Thelma R. Grimm and sundry citizens of Columbus, Ohio, requesting the passage of the Neely bill (S. 280); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art the Father of all men upon the earth, most heartily we pray that Thou wilt deliver Thy children from the cruelties of war and lead the nations into the way of peace. Teach us to put away all bitterness and misunderstanding, that we, with all the brethren of the Son of Man, may draw together as one comity of peoples and dwell evermore in the fellowship of that Prince of Peace who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit both now and for evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 29, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Callo-way, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9109) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lucas	Shipstead
Bailey	Frazier	Lundeen	Smathers
Bankhead	George	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gibson	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Gillette	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Glass	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Green	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gurney	Minton	Tobey
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chavez	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT MARMET, W. VA.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 173)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to be printed, as follows:

To the Senate:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, S. 1750, an act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes.

It is the purpose of this bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land aggregating approximately 4.38 acres, more or less, situated on the west side of the Great Kanawha River, at lock and dam No. 2, in Marmet, W. Va., no longer needed for the purpose for which acquired, and being a part of the 9.24 acres acquired by the Government in 1933 at a cost of \$25,000 for access purposes and as a site for the storage of equipment and materials during the construction of the dam. The town of Marmet desires the land for use as a play and recreational ground for the town, as well as the immediate environment at the Great Kanawha Valley.

The act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 800), authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of building sites under his control for which he had determined there was no further Federal need by sale and quitclaim deed to States, counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions, at a price not less than 50 percent of the value of the land as appraised by the Treasury Department; and the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 885), authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to sell any real property of the United States outside the District of Columbia and exclusive of military or naval reservations, surplus to the needs of the Federal Government, at public sale to the highest responsible bidder.

It would appear, therefore, that regardless of the procedure that may have been followed prior to the enactment in 1935 of these two laws, their enactment definitely establishes the intent of the Congress and the policy of the Federal Government, to the effect that it is not in the public interest to grant public land without compensation, although differentiating in favor of States, counties, and municipalities as to the amount of compensation that should be paid.

I feel compelled, therefore, to withhold my approval of the bill, but I would not object to the enactment of legislation which would permit the Secretary of War to deed this property to the town of Marmet at a price not less than 50 percent of the current appraised value thereof.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 1, 1940.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the message of the President, with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

THE ALASKA RAILROAD—MOUNT M'KINLEY NATIONAL PARK (S. DOC. NO. 174)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States transmitting draft of proposed provisions or amendments pertaining to the appropriation Alaska Railroad Special Fund (in the pending Interior Department appropriation bill, 1941), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN OATHS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate oaths required of masters of vessels and shippers of cargo in certain cases in which the requirement of such oaths is unnecessarily burdensome upon legitimate commerce and administratively impossible of enforcement, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chief scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth annual report of the Boy Scouts of America, with related reports, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Blanco National Farm Loan Association, of Blanco, Tex., favoring restoration of the Farm Credit Administration to the status of an independent bureau and placing the operations of the Federal land banks, national farm-loan associations, and other units of the Administration under the supervision of a bipartisan board appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Polish extraction of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City, N. Y., favoring the granting of relief to the people of Poland suffering as a result of the twofold invasion of that country, and also that such relief be distributed through American agencies, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WALSH presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for the location of a general hospital or diagnostic center in Boston, Mass., or in the vicinity thereof, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE—RESOLUTION OF THE MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD under the rule and reference to the Committee on Finance a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the Congress to enact the Connally bill, providing for additional old-age assistance. As the Senate will recall, during the last session, along with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and a number of our colleagues, I made every effort to have enacted the amendment offered at that time by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the social-security legislation, providing for increased old-age assistance to needy aged persons.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 22

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass the Connally bill providing for old-age assistance.

Whereas the State of Mississippi is not financially able to pay an adequate old-age pension without the aid and assistance of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Federal Government is granting Mississippi less money than any other State; and

Whereas the United States Senate is considering the Connally bill, providing that the Federal Government shall contribute to the States twice their contribution, up to \$15 per month: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to pass this measure.

RELIEF OF THE PEOPLE OF POLAND—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MEAD presented resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of citizens of Polish extraction of Binghamton, Endicott, and Johnson City, N. Y., held under the auspices of the Polish Community Club, of Binghamton, favoring the granting of relief to the people of Poland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH COMMUNITY HOME,
Binghamton, N. Y., March 17, 1940.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: For your consideration and official action we hereby respectfully submit to you, as directed by the mass meeting which unanimously adopted them, the following resolutions, with our respectful plea to personally help in carrying them out in letter and spirit and to have them spread upon the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for perusal, consideration, and action of Congress.

Resolved, That we, assembled here this Sunday evening, March 17, 1940, constituting the entire Polish population of Binghamton, N. Y., Johnson City, N. Y., Endicott, N. Y., and its environs, as American citizens, in accordance with American ideals and traditions, hereby petition our President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt; the Congress of the United States; Hon. John Nance Garner, the Vice President, as President of the United States Senate; Hon. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD, as Speaker of the House of Representatives; Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senator; Hon. JAMES MEAD, United States Senator; and the Honorable EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, Congressman from the Thirty-fourth District of New York, to support and to have Congress make the necessary appropriations for Polish relief and to take steps officially to answer the cry of distress and pleas for help of millions of suffering people of Poland, now temporarily in the toils and grips of the German Nazi and Russian Soviet invaders.

Resolved, That the aid and relief from our American Government, as well as all other aid and relief of the different and various humanitarian agencies of America, be distributed by Americans, and that it be carried on under American supervision in accordance with precedents and justice.

Resolved, That we hereby further petition our Government to see to it that all aid and relief from America for the suffering, needy, and starving people of Poland is carried on, distributed, and supervised by Americans for the benefit of people of Poland and not for the benefit of their enemies and invaders.

Resolved, That we hereby solemnly pledge our continued aid and support to the cause of giving aid and relief to the suffering, needy, and distressed people of Poland until they are free and independent and are with other free and civilized people of the world

permitted to carry on their mission for the benefit of freedom, humanity, civilization, and peace.

Resolved, That we further petition our Government to intervene for the cause of all humanity to prevent the hideous and barbarous treatment of all the peoples of Poland, and to protest most vigorously the unnecessary slaughter of a defenseless people; namely, the aged, women, and children.

The demonstration which the foregoing resolutions were presented and adopted was under the auspices of the Polish Community Club, which represents and combines the large organizations of Americans of Polish ancestry, their churches, and their institutions in the work of raising funds for helping the cause of Polish relief.

Respectfully submitted for your kind consideration and action by direction of the mass meeting and by the order of the Polish Community Club, for them and in their name.

Frank L. Wasileski; George Guzewicz, pastor of St. Stanislaus Church; Peter H. Morjka; Joseph Szwczak; Pauline Sulkowski; Helena Hlebica; Eugene H. Laskowski; Anthony Orsjewski; Joseph Kleklo; John Skialalak; and Stanley Slezark.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I present a letter in the nature of a petition from the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor asking for the defeat of the pending House Joint Resolution 407 unless it includes complete protection based on the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Detroit, Mich., March 29, 1940.

Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Upon instructions of the Detroit and Wayne County Federation of Labor, we desire to place before you a request that you vote against the continued authorization in reciprocal-trade treaties the admittance of any foreign-made products competitive with products made by American workers unless the total cost of these articles, including duties paid, are equal to the cost of American products or wholesale selling prices in the competitive American market.

Our delegates feel that to permit foreign-made products to enter this market in competition with American-made products on a price that is below that of American manufacturers' cost of production will only result in exporting the American workingman's job to a foreign country.

God knows we have plenty of unemployed in this country already without giving our jobs to workers in other countries where wage standards are below American wages.

Very respectfully,

DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY
FEDERATION OF LABOR,
FRANK X. MARTEL, President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3530) to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted a report thereon as indicated:

S. 3243. A bill to provide for a customhouse building at Miami, Fla.; and

H. R. 8540. A bill to authorize an increase in the White House Police force (Rept. No. 1361).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NYE:

S. 3694. A bill for the relief of Oscar G. Norgaard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 3695. A bill to remove the penalty of imprisonment for failure to answer questions on the census schedules; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 3696. A bill for a preliminary examination and survey of the southwest side of the Rappahannock River in the

vicinity of Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 3697. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Rhodes; to the Committee on Military Affairs; and

S. 3698. A bill to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3699. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes," approved July 15, 1932, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;

S. 3700. A bill providing for the construction or enlargement of certain public buildings at Salt Lake City, Utah; and

S. 3701. A bill authorizing an appropriation for the construction and enlargement of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 3702. A bill to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself and Mr. Downey):

S. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to authorize the coinage of silver 50-cent pieces to indicate the interest of the Government of the United States in the ideals and purposes of the Golden Gate International Exposition to be continued in 1940 and to authorize the issue of such coins to the San Francisco Bay Exposition sponsoring said international exposition and the sale thereof by the San Francisco Bay Exposition at par or at a premium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

S. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to deprive Congress of its power to regulate interstate commerce with the Indian tribes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. REYNOLDS introduced Senate Joint Resolution 238, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and appears under a separate heading.)

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 9109) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL—DENISON RESERVOIR, RED RIVER, TEX.—OKLA.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6264) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DONAHEY submitted an amendment proposing to pay Francis Biddle \$9,356.97 and Thomas A. Panter \$4,958.39 for salaries and expenses in satisfaction of their respective claims for balances due them under the terms of their employment by the Joint Committee to Investigate the Tennessee Valley Authority, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 8913, the legislative appropriation bill, 1941, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8745) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as follows:

On page 110, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"Dinosaur National Monument, Utah: For relieving the dinosaur skeletons on the quarry wall, for protection of such skeletons from the elements, for personal services, general expenses, supplies, traveling expenses, and mechanical equipment in connection with such project, including not exceeding \$1,400 for the purchase, maintenance, operation, and repair of a heavy-duty truck, \$40,080."

TELEVISION INVESTIGATION

Mr. LUNDEEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 251), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission on February 29, 1940, issued an order permitting limited commercial sponsorship of television beginning September 1, 1940; and

Whereas television interests immediately launched a manufacturing, advertising, and sales promotion campaign; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission on March 22, 1940, rescinded its order of February 29, 1940, with resultant confusion in the minds of the public and causing abandonment of manufacturing, advertising, and sales programs which had, in effect, been authorized by the Commission's earlier ruling: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce is hereby requested to investigate the actions of the Federal Communications Commission in connection with the development of television and, in particular, to ascertain whether the Commission has exceeded its authority, and whether it has interfered with the freedom of public and private enterprise.

ROBERT H. HINCKLEY, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 30, 1940, relative to Hon. Robert H. Hinckley, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. SMITH W. PURDUM AT DEDICATION OF FEDERAL BUILDING, HARRISONBURG, VA.

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Hon. Smith W. Purdum, on the occasion of the dedication of the post office and courthouse building at Harrisonburg, Va., on March 23, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY DON WHITEHEAD ON THE T. V. A.

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Don Whitehead, published in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 31, 1940, entitled "T. V. A. Oldest New Deal Experiment, Closing Seventh Year," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SILVER PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY HENRY H. HEIMANN

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Silver Program," written by Henry H. Heimann, and published in the March 15, 1940, issue of the Monthly Business Review of the National Association of Credit Men, which appears in the Appendix.]

WALTER WINCHELL ON PREPAREDNESS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Walter Winchell on the subject of preparedness, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW YORK'S STAKE IN FORESTRY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by R. M. Evans, regional forester, in regard to the timber and forestry resources of the State of New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARTICLE BY LEON PEARSON ENTITLED "BELOW THE RIO GRANDE"

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Leon Pearson entitled "Below the Rio Grande," published in the Washington Times-Herald of Sunday, March 31, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE 1940 CENSUS

[Mr. HERRING asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Des Moines (Iowa) Register of March 29, 1940, entitled "What To Do When Census Man Knocks," which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WEATHER BUREAU

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate took a recess last Friday the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] had

offered an amendment to the pending joint resolution and expressed the hope that he might address the Senate upon it today. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, permit me not to allow the record of our action on the 1941 agricultural bill to be closed without voicing regret of the inadequate treatment we have accorded the Weather Bureau.

Respect for the gentlemen who serve faithfully on the Appropriations Committee constrains me to make this statement, not in protest but as a constructively intended suggestion.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his distinguished associates have faced a peculiarly difficult task. Their conclusions were reached sincerely. I am grateful for the \$116,000 which their action has added to the Weather Bureau's prospective funds. I can even understand that it took courage and persistence on the part of clear-thinking Senators to make that addition; but it falls short of the \$400,000 increase approved and recommended by the Budget Bureau, for one of the most important services in our civil establishments.

I am proud of the United States Weather Bureau. I am proud of its 70 years of service to the American people. I am proud of its high score in economy. I am proud of its increasingly high score in accuracy of prediction. I am proud of its open-minded ability to adopt new methods and to set new goals in the form of constantly higher standards of accomplishment.

I am proud of American aviation. To aviation I give the credit for confronting the Weather Bureau with a challenge for more detailed observing and casting. A pilot about to fly an airplane from Cleveland to Chicago could not get along with merely a prediction of the weather at Cleveland, or even with a knowledge of the weather conditions within a 50- or 60-mile radius of Cleveland. He had to know what the weather would be 3 hours thereafter in Chicago; otherwise he would not know whether he could land safely. And he had to know what weather to expect at every intermediate point in order to know whether he could take his flight through. Moreover, his information had to be current and accurate; he was staking his life on it.

Observations taken at widely scattered sampling spots once or twice or four times a day would not do. Aviation required a sure knowledge of weather changes; and that called for hourly observations at points less than 100 miles apart. Furthermore, the airplane pilot could not proceed solely on a knowledge of surface weather. He also had to know the strength and direction of winds aloft; the temperature, pressure, the humidity of the upper air at various altitudes; where ice was forming, and where he could avoid it.

So different were the weather requirements of aviation from any requirements that had preceded them, that, after we passed the Air Commerce Act of 1936, and in that act charged the Weather Bureau with the duty of furnishing meteorological service for the civil airways, the Weather Bureau developed, in addition to its general weather service—a distinct new aerological or airway weather service to meet the needs of aviation.

Then came the revelation that the accurate and timely observations and forecasts made for the airways were worth their weight in gold to the general weather service. Seized upon and used for the benefit of everybody, they raised the general weather service to a new standard of helpfulness.

Likewise, with the upper-air soundings. Weather observations of this character were begun in 1898 with the use of kites and captive balloons, as a part of the general weather service. Upper-air wind measurements, begun 20 years later, likewise were first undertaken as a part of the general weather service. Such intensive and successful development did these activities receive at the hands of the Weather Bureau's airway establishment that today whenever we hear them mentioned I believe we think of them as special services for the

benefit of aviation. Quite on the contrary, the development they have undergone to meet the exacting requirements of aviation have made them vastly more useful to everybody. The knowledge gained from even the limited number of upper-air observations now made has formed the basis for learning the behavior of the great air masses which generate the weather. And this increased knowledge, in turn, is making it possible to make surprisingly accurate long-range predictions. Thanks to this general progress arising from the developments required by aviation, it will be possible within the next few years—assuming that we do not withhold the necessary appropriations—to have the weather accurately predicated many days in advance.

The wise administration of the Weather Bureau last year began to combine the "general" and "airway" weather services. At Kansas City and at Albuquerque, all of the general forecasting for a great bank of the Southwestern States is now done at the airway forecast centers. And so successful have been the results that in the 1941 fiscal program, which we have just enacted, the two formerly separate services have been combined throughout for the entire country.

But when that fiscal program came to this Congress, I regret to say that we made this wise unification of the weather service a basis for cutting down the Budget recommendation for its support. The Budget Bureau recommended an increase of \$400,000 for 1941, over the sum of the two previously separate appropriations for the fiscal year 1940. The money was for specific and badly needed new items of work, all set out in explicit detail and with excellent justification.

Management of the Weather Bureau's work as one unit is, of course, going to lead to better husbandry of money. But I think it surpasses human expectation to believe that even the Weather Bureau can effect \$300,000 worth of economy in the first year of the unification.

Let me cite one illustration: In the coming fiscal year the Weather Bureau should spend an additional \$250,000 in securing weather reports from ships on the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans. We require a certain amount of service of that nature, but if we do not appropriate the money to pay for it we do not get it. No amount of administrative wisdom or unified management can reduce this type of cost.

Similarly, a large part of the Weather Bureau's yearly expenditures is for telegraph tolls. The size of the bill depends on the number of messages. As new observing stations are required, and as more observations per day become necessary, this bill is bound to go up. Either we appropriate the money or the Weather Bureau cannot buy the service.

Eventually, I am sure, savings will be effected which may even exceed the \$300,000 presumed in the report from the House Appropriations Committee which I have been quoting; but no such savings will be achieved in the first year, or the first 2 years, of articulating such a huge mechanism, especially when the service faces urgent and growing necessity of expansion.

I saw the estimate of improvements in the Weather Bureau's facilities that remained unprovided for after we had enacted the 1940 appropriation bill. The total was a little over \$1,800,000. That list had its origin in the work of the special committee presided over by my illustrious predecessor, the distinguished Senator Royal S. Copeland. I know that each segment which had been removed from the list and appropriated for in the past three agricultural bills had been subjected to the closest scrutiny, not only by the Weather Bureau, but successively by the Secretary of Agriculture and his fiscal officers, the Budget Bureau, Mr. Cannon's committee in the House, and our own Appropriations Committee, of which Senator Copeland was a member; and that the items which were provided for in those appropriations fully stood up under that scrutiny. I know that on at least two occasions since the 1940 Appropriation Act was passed, the Weather Bureau has subjected that \$1,800,000 residue to a battering analysis, in which the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the military and civil users of the airways have participated, in order to knock out of the list every possible unnecessary or unjustifiable item. Yet that list stands today

at \$2,003,600. Every possible reduction in it has been offset, and the total even a little outbalanced, by the current and reasonable increase that goes hand in hand with the normal growth of an essential service.

That means that today we ought to be spending \$2,000,000 more on the Weather Bureau than we are spending. I have not deducted the \$216,000 by which the appropriation stands increased in the 1941 agricultural bill as we have returned it to the House. I mentioned a few moments ago that the Weather Bureau's telegraph charges amount to \$400,000 a year. On January 1, after the 1941 Budget estimates had been completed, the Federal Communications Commission increased by 50 percent the rates which the Government pays for telegraph messages. You can figure the result for yourselves. The \$216,000 which we have added to the Weather Bureau's funds is going to amount to about \$16,000 net. The result is that for another 15 months we are leaving the Weather Bureau service exactly where it is, except for such economies as the unified management of activities may engender.

This means something to all of us. I am not now talking about the remaining gaps along the airways. I am not talking about the regrettable delay in realizing the benefits of long-range air-mass forecasts. I am not talking about the handicap we are putting ourselves under, in flying the Pacific, in flying the Atlantic, and in pioneering the great frontier of the South Pacific to New Zealand, all without making provision for weather reports from the oceans. I am talking in homely terms which I think every Senator will understand.

I mean that in my home city of Buffalo, the Weather Bureau station will continue for 15 months to make one daily observation of the upper-air weather instead of the two per day that it ought to make. I mean that the weather observatory on Whiteface Mountain, that ought to be functioning today, will not be established until 1942 or 1943. I mean that the new off-airway station that ought to be established at Watertown will not be established, and that the stations at Canton and Delhi and Knapp Creek and Lake Placid, which ought to make observations and send in reports every 3 hours, will still be operating on a 6-hour schedule no matter how rapidly the weather changes.

My distinguished colleagues from Arizona will find that their State will have to get along for another 15 months without a Weather Bureau airport staff at at least two places where such a staff should be functioning today; without two new off-airway stations that ought to be operating this month and this minute; without a mountain observatory which ought to be established within the next 6 months; and with at least three of their existing Weather Bureau stations continuing to function at half efficiency.

I could go down the list of States and be equally specific. The \$216,000 that we added to the 1941 Weather Bureau appropriation has a history. I have shown how it resulted from paring down unjustifiably a Budget recommendation of \$400,000. The \$400,000 Budget recommendation itself was the product of paring. The Chief of the Weather Bureau testified in the Senate hearings that the amount which the Department had asked the Budget Bureau to recommend was at least twice that much. If the Department's request was \$800,000, that was still only 40 percent of the currently existing needs. And I have shown that the increase we have voted, in which I hope the House will concur, has been all but swallowed up by the increase in the Weather Bureau's telegraph bill.

This is no way to catch up with current needs. I ask that we start now to put ourselves in a frame of mind so that when the next Weather Bureau budget recommendations come before us we will stop being ostriches. The only way to buy \$2,000,000 worth of needed service is to appropriate \$2,000,000.

GRASSHOPPER AND MORMON CRICKET CONTROL CAMPAIGNS

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada that I am asking him to yield for the purpose of having read a letter pertaining to an item in the deficiency appropriation bill which is now in conference. I think I ought to tell the Senator that I am going to ask that it be read. However, it is not a long letter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. NORRIS. I send to the desk a letter which I ask to have read and referred to the Senate conferees on the deficiency appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read and referred as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I call the attention of the conferees to the letter. I think it has a direct bearing on the appropriation bill they have in charge.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, STATE OF NEBRASKA, March 26, 1940.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: Information has reached the Nebraska Grasshopper Control Committee that a shortage of funds is causing serious delay in Federal activities necessary for the most effective conduct of the grasshopper and Mormon cricket control campaigns for the coming season. Materials that should be ordered immediately are not being purchased, repairs to trucks and other machinery needed in the work are being delayed, and the necessary arrangements for field offices and supervisors are not being made. All of these are fundamental to the success of the actual control program.

Organization of the work must not be interrupted now if crop losses are to be prevented. It is therefore important that the proposed appropriation for the control of grasshoppers and Mormon crickets be made available at the earliest possible moment. The success of this program is vital to Nebraska interests and any further help that you can give will be appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

W. H. BROKAW,
Chairman, Director Extension Service,
LOUIS BUCHHOLZ,
Director of Agriculture.
W. W. BURR,
Director of Experimental Station.
MYRON H. SWENK,
Chairman, Department of Entomology.
FRANK B. O'CONNELL,
Secretary, Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Just a word in line with the letter which has been read.

The deficiency appropriation bill as it came to the Senate carried \$2,000,000 for the grasshopper and Mormon cricket control program, and the Senate added a further million dollars. The conference report was rejected, and the matter has now gone to the House. The House, of course, is its own master, and we have been waiting for the House either to authorize its conferees to have a further conference or to take some other action in regard to the bill. The Senate asked a further conference and appointed conferees in order to take up this one item in dispute; so we are now awaiting the action of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say further that there is now in this fund, left over from last year, the sum of \$400,000, which may be used for any necessary immediate purpose in eradicating or controlling the pests. The Senator from Colorado has correctly stated the facts.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I may say a word in reply to the two Senators, who are members of the conference committee of the Senate, I have had this letter read, coming from the authorized officials of the various Nebraska organizations having to do with the grasshopper and Mormon cricket plague, for the purpose of giving information to the conferees, and have had it referred to the conferees, so that when the proper time comes, if the House does not recede prior to any conference, the Senate conferees may have this information, which I think is very valuable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be referred to the Senate conferees on the first deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 8641).

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, before referring to the amendment which I offered at the last session of the Senate and had read, I desire to touch upon the correspondence which was inserted in the RECORD by the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] a few moments ago. I address both able Senators—one from Colorado and the other from Nebraska—on the subject of the letter. The Senator from Colorado being the chairman of the Senate conferees, I naturally ask for his attention for the reason that, in keeping with the letter placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Nebraska, a number of telegrams and letters have come to me from my own State, which is now being infested with the first hatch of Mormon crickets.

If there is anything in the world that is destructive of vegetable life in general, much more destructive than even the grasshopper infestation, it is the Mormon cricket. Not only that, but those having control of the transcontinental highways are instructed to post the highways to advise those who travel to be careful because of the danger from Mormon crickets. Many accidents have occurred, some of them resulting in the loss of human life, by reason of the infestation of Mormon crickets covering the highways and so smearing the roads that automobiles skid and go off the grades. That is one thing, but vegetation in general is now being threatened and destroyed by the annual infestation of Mormon crickets which is now manifesting itself. If we can have action taken now, while the Mormon cricket is in his adolescent stage, we can at least put an end to the greatest part of the destruction. I join the Senator from Nebraska in the suggestion to the Senator from Colorado, and others on the conference committee.

Mr. President, to address myself now to the amendment which I had read last Friday, and which has to do with exempting commodities upon which excise taxes have been approved by Congress in years past from the effect of the reciprocal-trade law, there are four commodities which Congress saw fit to protect by way of what we term excise taxes. The able chairman of the Committee on Finance may take issue with the term "excise taxes." The reason why I take that position is because the RECORD shows that, in 1934, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], intimated that, in his judgment, these taxes were not excise taxes, but were duties.

In the same speech, Mr. President, the able Senator from Mississippi made it known, not only in one presentation upon the floor of the Senate, but in two, as I recall, that the excise taxes on copper, coal, lumber, and oil were regarded by him, and were to be regarded by those who had the administration of the reciprocal-trade law, as frozen; in other words, they were not to be affected by any action of the President under the reciprocal-trade law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield in a moment. The able Senator from Mississippi made that exceedingly plain by using the term "frozen," and I draw it to his attention. In other words, the taxes were not to be at all affected by the measure which we were considering in 1934, and which we again considered in 1937, and which is again before the Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the trend of the Senator's argument, because I intend to discuss this matter in my own time, but, since the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, has been mentioned, I do wish to call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that, while the chairman of the committee stated that, in his opinion, the excise taxes should be "frozen," the chairman of the committee later offered an amendment to incor-

porate in the bill itself a provision for freezing those excise taxes, and that on the very bitter protest of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], one of the champions of the excise tax on copper, the Senator from Mississippi then withdrew the amendment; it was then reoffered by the then Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, and defeated by the Senate on a ye and nay vote, the vote being 29 to 57, and among those voting "nay" on that question were the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. It seems to me that sufficiently disposes of what was held out in the discussion of the subject during the consideration of the act of 1934.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri correctly cites the RECORD; but it will be recalled that prior to the time the Senator from Arizona protested the amendment which was to be offered by the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Mississippi had made the statement, had made it clear, had made it emphatic, that all excise taxes were regarded as frozen. He used the word "frozen." When that statement was made on the floor of this legislative body by the chairman of the committee having to do with that particular subject, wherein he said in emphatic terms that excise taxes on particular commodities which the body had under consideration then should be frozen, those of us who come from the States producing these commodities regarded it as a solemn declaration, a solemn statement of purpose, an indication of what the purpose of the legislation was; and we thought that that purpose, so declared, and that statement, so announced by the chairman of the Committee on Finance, would be carried out in entirety.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I may say to the Senator that substantially the same statement was made in the report of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives when it presented the proposed legislation in the first place. So the Senator has not only the assurance of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, he has the assurance of the text of the House Ways and Means Committee report.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sure the Senator is entirely correct, from my reading of what occurred.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a further interruption, it seems to me that the action of the Senate itself, by an overwhelming majority of two to one rejecting such an amendment to freeze the tax, is of the highest importance and of the most compelling force.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. I prefer not to yield just now. I prefer to answer the Senator. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, there is an answer.

Mr. McCARRAN. The vote on the amendment offered by the late lamented and much beloved Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, followed the announcement of the Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Finance. I voted against the Long amendment, because I relied on the word of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and I thought there was no necessity for doing more.

Mr. President, I state, without fear of contradiction, believing that I am as correct as to others as I am as to myself, that other Senators voted against the Long amendment, because the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who had the subject in hand, had promised us, had said here on the floor on at least two occasions, that it was not the intent at all to interfere with those things which were covered by excise taxes.

I represented a State which produced only one of the commodities; that is, copper. There were here on the floor of the Senate those who represented States which produced others of the commodities, namely, lumber, coal, and oil. I voted on the Long amendment, and I am one of those, as I recall, voting against the Long amendment, because of the history of the whole transaction, the history of the whole proposition from beginning to end.

Now, if the Senator from Michigan wishes to have me yield, I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is interesting to note another collateral fact of the time. I think that when the able Senator from Mississippi offered his amendment, intending in good faith to carry out his promise to us that these excise taxes should not be reduced, his reason for withdrawing the amendment was that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] made a fervid plea that nothing should be done to prevent an increase in the protection which copper should receive. His protest was against something which would prevent an increase. Of course, that is a totally different contemplation. Some of us did not understand his position at the time, and I think perhaps he may have misapprehended the purpose of the amendment, but he clearly made it obvious that he was taking his position against any stricture which would prevent an increased protection for copper.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the Senator from Michigan has put this construction on the matter, I should merely like to call attention to the fact that the issue was drawn with the greatest possible clearness by the late Senator from Louisiana, and no man who has served in this body during my membership in the Senate could draw an amendment with greater clearness than he could when he desired to do so. I read from the RECORD of June 4, 1934, page 10392. The Senator from Mississippi interrupted the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that I withdrew the amendment.

Mr. LONG. I am not censuring the Senator from Mississippi. I am offering his amendment, which I presume he will support. I believe he will.

Mr. President, we were told that these commodities would be protected because the tariffs we have on oil and lumber and coal and copper are very necessary. A number of Senators and I fought here many nights and many days to get tariffs on these items, and we want to protect them.

Senators will notice that he said "tariffs," not "excises."

We were assured that they would be protected. Today, as an example, notwithstanding the fact that it is said we have an overproduction of oil in America, nonetheless we are importing into the country 260,000 barrels of oil a day. Notwithstanding all our lumber trouble and the cheapness of lumber, lumber is still being imported. We were told, and we believed, and I am sure Senators mean to stick by it, that we should have this tariff protection, and it would be disastrous to us if it were not given to us.

I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The Senator from Louisiana drew that issue with the greatest possible clearness and explicitness.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes, Mr. President; but if the Senator will now read the observations of the Senator from Arizona, he will find that they entirely justify the observation I made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I read the observations of the Senator from Arizona this morning, and before that on yesterday, and, further, I heard them when they were delivered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think we have all gone through the history of when this record was made. There is no doubt in my mind as to what was the intentment of the Senator from Mississippi when, as chairman of the Committee on Finance, he made the statement before the Senate to which I have referred. He will not deny that he made the statement. He sought at that time to establish a fact; he sought at that time to do what many of us do in debate here, to have it understood as the sense of this body what was intended by the proposed legislation then pending. If the Senator from Mississippi had intended anything else, of course he would now contradict me. He was clear; he was frank; he was honest about it. He wanted those of us who were interested in excise taxes to know he wanted those representing the copper-producing States, for instance, to know that the 4 cents imposed as an excise tax or duty on copper would not be disturbed, because he knew, as we know, as the able Senator from Arizona, representing one

of the great copper-producing States of the Union, knows, that if the 4-cent excise tax or protection is taken off copper, the copper mines of Arizona will be closed. I know that if the 4-cent tax on copper is taken off, the copper mines of Nevada will be closed, and I know that if the copper mines of Nevada are closed, five or six or seven thousand miners, together with their dependents, will be put on the relief rolls.

Mr. President, the able Senator from Montana knows that when the 4-cent excise tax is taken off copper the mines of Butte will be closed and Butte copper miners will be put on the relief rolls. Some of us would battle until the end to obtain a clear knowledge of the effect of the reciprocal-trade agreements on the 4-cent tax protection to copper.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I can verify the statement just made by the able Senator from Nevada with respect to the effect of the withdrawal of the excise tax, or a material modification of it, on copper production and employment in Montana. During the year 1929, when the country was enjoying the highest degree of prosperity, the mines in Butte, Mont., were already closing down because foreign-produced copper could be delivered in New York for less than the cost of production in Montana. These conditions rapidly increased in the years following. The mines operated by the Anaconda Copper Co. in Chile were shipping cheaply produced copper into this country free of duty and delivering it here at a price cheaper than the figure at which it could be produced in Montana and other copper-producing States. So it seems to me, Mr. President, that if anything should now be done affecting the operation of these excise taxes it would have a disastrous effect on the American copper producer.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the junior Senator from Montana for the contribution he has made, because no one in this body understands the copper situation better than he does. From the standpoint of the welfare of the toiler, no State in the Union is more greatly affected or will be more greatly affected than the State of Montana. The State of Utah, the State of Nevada, the State of Arizona, all the copper-producing States, are interested in knowing that the industry is protected perpetually, so that copper produced by slave labor and under slave conditions shall not be brought into this country to close American mines and thus throw our miners out of employment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator might add that under the latest copper development in South Africa, where the copper is virtually scooped off the ground, it can be delivered in New York for almost the amount of the 4-cent excise protection which we are seeking to maintain.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator from Michigan for his contribution. The Senator from Michigan represents a State, and represents it ably, which is equally interested in the subject of copper.

Let me deal with this subject from a factual standpoint. Today Northern Rhodesia can export copper to this country so cheaply that no American copper mine, in competition with it, can possibly operate and pay even working expenses. The average wage per day in Rhodesia is in the neighborhood of 30 cents. The average wage per day in Chile is less than 60 cents. The average wage of the American miner in the copper industry is based upon a scale which depends on the market price of copper. Today our copper miners, working in the copper mines of Montana, Nevada, Arizona, and other copper producing States, are earning from \$4.50 to \$6.50 a day.

When the 50-cent copper produced under slave and peon labor in Chile is imported into this country, in competition with the copper produced under the American standards of living, the result is simply to close down the copper mines of the United States. When oil produced in South America, under present conditions there, is imported into the United States and competes with the oil-producing States of this

country, the result is to destroy or impair our oil-producing industry.

Why am I interested in this subject? Because in my State and the other States producing copper, miners are employed. They are not industrial States from the standpoint of processing. They employ miners to produce the raw commodity from the mines. The continued operation of their mines allows the miners and their dependents to enjoy American life by their own industry and by their own efforts. If the price of these commodities is reduced, and our miners are placed in competition with slave labor abroad, then confidence in American institutions is destroyed.

As I have said, I represent a State which produces only one of the commodities under consideration. The Senators from Michigan represent a State interested not only in copper, but in lumber as well. The State of Arizona is interested in the production of copper. Other States, such as Pennsylvania and Oklahoma are interested in oil production. In every one of these instances those who are engaged in the production of these commodities are looking to the continuation of the excise tax, so that the industry thus protected may be permitted to continue, so that the toilers in those States may know that it is not a question which rests in the hands or on the judgment of some particular appointed individual, who has no responsibility to the people of the United States, but who will decide in Washington, in a star-chamber proceeding, whether or not the industry on which the toiler depends shall go forward or shall be closed down and go out of existence.

Mr. President, that is why some of us are protesting to the end that this reciprocal-trade law shall not touch upon or impinge upon those commodities with respect to which the Congress of the United States, based upon investigation and understanding, has placed an excise tax.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that in October of last year in this Chamber the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] discussed the history of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and the effect of the trade agreements upon the excise tax. I recall very vividly when these excise taxes were included in the tariff law. At that time I was very much interested, and I am now interested in the excise tax on lumber. I suggested at the time of the speech by the Senator from Michigan that we knew or at least felt encouraged that if the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed the excise tax would not be molested. I was given on this floor full assurance by the chairman of the Committee on Finance that the excise duty upon the four products which the Senator has mentioned would not be touched. I was given the same assurance that they would not be touched, by the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. This assurance was given after a discussion had with several other Senators with respect to the difference between tariff rates and excise duties.

We relied upon these repeated assurances, and I say to the able Senator that in the northwestern section of the country a great injury was done to the timber and forest-products industry when the \$1 excise tax was removed from lumber products. I do not want to see a recurrence of such a thing in connection with the other commodities with respect to which we have now imposed the excise tax. I think the copper industry and the other industries which are still in that category of protection should still continue there, without any notion on the part of the Secretary of State that the tax should be removed, but in view of the precedent with respect to lumber, unquestionably if the Secretary or his advisers believed that they could get a better trade agreement on copper from a copper-producing country, that excise duty on copper would be removed.

We judge of the future by what has occurred in the past, and in spite of the efforts which were made by myself and others to persuade the Secretary of State to honor the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the dollar excise tax was taken off. And what is true of lumber will be true of copper if the opportunity arises which

might justify such action on the part of the Secretary of State or his advisers.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his observation, because it is a true statement of what has occurred and is not denied by the able Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, what has followed since the making of the legislative history to which we have referred? Following the action under the reciprocal-trade law which affected lumber, last September, as will be recalled, there was proposed a reciprocal-trade agreement between this country and Chile, by which copper was to be affected. Immediately the able Senators from Arizona, leading the vanguard of those of us who are opposed to a change in copper excise taxes, went before the representatives of the State Department and protested any change in the excise tax on copper. There was a debate on the floor of the Senate, I recall, between the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Mississippi, in which the language of the Senator from Mississippi was brought back again to the floor of the Senate, language by which we had been assured that these excise taxes were "frozen," to use the expression of the Senator from Mississippi. Notwithstanding that, those in charge of the reciprocal trade agreement machinery in the State Department were seriously considering reducing the tariff on copper. All of a sudden, after the protest became sufficiently violent and it was sufficiently apparent that the representatives of the copper-producing States were not going to support the continuation of the Reciprocal Trade Act, there was an announcement to the effect that copper had been dropped from the program and would not be affected.

If, notwithstanding the assurance given by the chairman of the Committee on Finance to the United States Senate, and the promise given to Senators, which caused the Senators from Arizona to vote against the Long amendment, those having control of the administration of the reciprocal-trade law had the temerity to include copper as a commodity upon which there was to be a proposed reduction—if notwithstanding all that those having control of the administration of the reciprocal-trade law had the temerity to dare to say that they would affect the excise taxes on copper, then there is no telling to what lengths they might go, notwithstanding any promise which might be made.

I say without fear of contradiction that the bill could not have been passed in 1934 if it had not been for the promise to which I refer and the understanding between the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the Senate. I believe the measure renewing the reciprocal-trade law could not have been passed in 1937 if it had not been for that understanding. Nevertheless, those having control of the administration of the reciprocal-trade law say that that understanding does not bind them. They propose to affect, and have already affected, two of the commodities and will affect more.

The Congress of the United States did not intend to pass a law which would permit those who have no responsibility to the people to affect a tax which was intended to be exempt from the effect of the law. Therefore, my amendment is offered so that the promise given by the chairman of the Finance Committee may be written into the law.

Mr. President, I think that what applies to four commodities should apply to every commodity on which an excise tax has been imposed; but inasmuch as only four commodities were mentioned by the chairman of the Committee on Finance in his promise to this body, my amendment touches only those four commodities. I hope the amendment may be adopted, so as to make it clear that when a Senator as able, experienced, and as much loved and honored in this body as is the chairman of the Committee on Finance, gives his promise to this body, that promise will be as good as law.

Mr. President, some Senators now in the Chamber have not heard the amendment stated. I ask unanimous consent that it be stated at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after "1940", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following:

with the proviso that the authority conferred in the said act does not embrace authority to include in any trade-agreement negotiations excise taxes imposed under the provisions of paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c) of section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, which are now a part of the Internal Revenue Code, subtitle (c), chapter 29, subchapter (b), part 1, sections 3420, 3422, 3423, 3424, 3425.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, returning to the subject, I shall not detain the Senate much longer, except to draw to the attention of the Senate the history of this legislation, the fact that it was enacted in 1934, and the fact that at its enactment Senators who were interested in the subject matter of the four commodities affected, namely, copper, coal, lumber, and oil, had it made plain to them that the law would not affect those commodities. It was under those circumstances that the law was enacted in the first instance. At the risk of repetition, I say that it would not have been enacted if it had been known that the intention was to affect copper.

The remarks of the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] have been referred to. He may be considered the dean among Senators representing copper-producing States. At that time assurance was given to the Senator from Arizona. He did not want the proposed amendment to go in, because the assurance was even greater and more sacred than the amendment itself.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Evidently the Senator has not lately read the objection of the Senator from Arizona, because I am certain that if the Senator had read it at any recent time he would not make the statement he has just made.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I read it as recently as this morning. The Senator from Arizona said that the amendment was born in iniquity, and so forth. He denounced it very bitterly. He denounced it because of the very answer that was given by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] a few moments ago, namely, that there would be a freezing with regard to the raising of the tax in protection of copper. It was his position that the 4-cent copper protection now afforded by the revenue law might be raised when, as, and if conditions in this country and abroad demanded the protection of an American industry in which hundreds of thousands of miners and their dependents are involved.

Mr. President, I leave the question with the Senate. It is not a matter to which I propose to devote much time, because the facts are so plain. The whole history of the legislation is clear. My good friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], notwithstanding the fact that he has been presented time and again with statements which he made, sees fit to corroborate what I say by his silence.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to submit an inquiry to the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] with regard to the history of the legislation, or at least call his attention to some of the history involved in the colloquy a few moments ago with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] regarding what took place on the floor of the Senate with regard to the discussion of these four commodities. I refer to page 1766 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, October 31, 1939. On page 1084 the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] asked:

Is it not a fact that at the time the reciprocal trade treaty law was passed every effort was made on the floor of the Senate to make it clear and plain that the excise taxes on copper, coal, lumber, and oil were beyond the jurisdiction of the trade-treaty negotiators?

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] then interposed and stated:

That effort was very definitely made at the time the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act was under consideration. As a practical mat-

ter, it does not make sense to me to say that Congress would intentionally pass an act permitting tariff duties to be raised and lowered and have in mind anything other than an established tariff. If Congress does not act, the excise tax automatically expires, and then what have we? We have nothing to negotiate about. If, by the enactment of the reciprocal trade agreement law, the State Department had power to freeze the excise tax on copper at 2 cents without further action by Congress, I should say then there would be some logic to the proposed negotiations; but when the fact is that if nothing is done the tax automatically expires, it clearly indicates to me not only that Congress never contemplated that the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act should apply to excise taxes of this character, but in addition it would seem that any negotiations with Chile must rest on an unsound and insubstantial basis.

That statement certainly covers the attitude of the Senator from Arizona. It is supplemental to what has been stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I am not now testifying, but I made a statement along the same line. So I think it must be clear to anyone that when we considered the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, everyone relied on the assurances that these particular excise taxes would not be touched. I think that is the recollection of the Senator from Nevada. It is the recollection of the Senator from Michigan, of the Senator from Arizona, and of myself. We are all recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1084 and subsequent pages.

Mr. President, I call attention to this matter only because of the statement made a few moments ago by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that no such implication could be gleaned from the statement of the Senator from Arizona.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not only is the Senator entirely correct, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the inception of this question until the present time bears out the statement made by the Senator from Oregon. More than that, in June 1939, the Congress reenacted the excise tax of 4 cents on copper. That was long after we had enacted the reciprocal-trade law, showing what the intendment of Congress was as regards the freezing of the excise tax bearing on copper.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire briefly to state my reasons for opposing—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lucas	Shipstead
Bailey	Frazier	Lundeen	Smathers
Bankhead	George	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gibson	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Gillette	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Glass	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Green	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gurney	Minton	Tobey
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chavez	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWELLENBACH in the chair). Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to state briefly my reasons for opposing the further extension of the policy of reciprocal-trade agreements. I should like, before doing so, to join sincerely in the general expressions of praise for the character and integrity of the Secretary of State. I have had the pleasure of his acquaintance for many years, going back to the time when he was in the House of Representatives and I was in the press gallery. He was courteous and

considerate to me then and has been so since. I can sincerely express the same regard for Senators who are on the opposite side of this question. Certainly the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has been an extremely fair chairman, and has always given those who were in the minority full opportunity to exercise their rights.

I am, first of all, impressed by the constitutional arguments in opposition to the pending joint resolution which have been so ably advanced in the week that has just passed. I cannot rid myself of the notion that this is an instance, to use the words Mr. Justice Cardozo employed in connection with a case pending before the Supreme Court, of "delegation run riot," and that if the Congress can abdicate so much of its power having to do with the raising of revenue and with the conclusion of treaties, it can equally well abdicate a great deal more of its power with respect to other equally essential functions of government. It is clear that if our government of checks and balances and our constitutional theory have any reality this is a case in which the power of the Executive should be curbed.

I am also impressed by the following arguments: First, that treaties require a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and that so-called trade agreements are treaties; second, the constitutional provision that "all legislative power shall be vested in a Congress"—the word "all" should be stressed in that connection—and, third, the constitutional provision that revenue bills shall originate in the House of Representatives.

I am informed that of the 22 nations with whom we have concluded trade agreements some 18 or 19 require that agreements made with them shall be ratified by the parliamentary body of the nation concerned.

It is clear also that this is a question in which partisanship really has no place. It has been demonstrated time and time again since this debate began that Republicans and Democrats have been on both sides of this question. I will not detain the Senate by quoting from the utterances of prominent statesmen on this subject. I should like, for the RECORD, however, as one exception, to cite the statement made by Secretary Hull when he was a Member of the House of Representatives with regard to a proposal which was much more limited than this and which he opposed in the following terms. I quote:

The proposed enlargement and broad expansion of the provisions and functions of the flexible-tariff clause is astonishing, is undoubtedly unconstitutional, and is violative of the functions of the American Congress. Not since the Commons wrenched from an English king the power and authority to control taxation has there been a transfer of the taxing power back to the head of a government on a basis so broad and unlimited as is proposed in the pending bill. As has been said on a former occasion, "this is too much power for a bad man to have or for a good man to want."

I believe those words, which were so eloquently uttered in connection with a legislative proposal far less broad in its scope than this one, should give us pause today.

Mr. President, so much for the constitutional aspects. I am not going to detain the Senate long on the economic aspects of the case, except to reiterate the conviction I have expressed here before that to sell American goods to Americans is not only just as good as selling them to foreigners, but is better. The free-trade economic philosophy would have us believe that if an automobile made in Michigan, let us say, is sold in Europe, the transaction, by some mysterious alchemy, by some mystic induction, creates some new wealth which is not created if the automobile is sold to an American citizen. I have yet to see that proposition demonstrated. I have yet to see it proved. It seems to me that if an American automobile is sold to an American citizen, whether he lives in Massachusetts or whether he lives in Texas, or whatever State he may live in, it is better than selling the automobile abroad, because the American citizen who buys the automobile is going to be a customer for parts and for tires and for gasoline and for oil; he is going to eat at wayside lunch-rooms, and in every way he is going to continue being a spender; and in order to maintain that car such expenditures will be made to American citizens instead of being made to foreigners.

I do not want to labor the economic argument, because it has been done much more ably than I can do it, and it is a two-sided proposition. But I contend that we are hypnotized by the idea that there is an advantage in selling our goods to foreigners over selling them to ourselves.

I should like to say, too, that I detest the old logrolling system just as much as do any of the advocates of the joint resolution. I should not want to go back to it. I was not in politics when the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was passed. I note that it has not been repealed, although certainly the party in power has the votes in both branches of Congress to do so. I do not want to return to the logrolling method. The goal which appeals to me is the goal of William McKinley, who said, in 1897:

The end in view is always to be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend rather to increase their employment.

There is a definite standard, an American standard, and a reasonable standard. I think those of us who oppose the pending measure—I know it is true in my case—favor a scientific tariff, arrived at in a scientific, decent, intellectually self-respecting way. We believe there ought to be some kind of a standard established, and that a question such as, Shall the United States be protectionist, or shall it be free trade? should not be left to the discretion of an administrative official. I should like to see a scientific tariff established with a protectionist philosophy, but, regardless of philosophy, I should like to see some kind of a standard written into this joint resolution.

This brings me to the point which impresses me the most, and which I do not think has been touched on as much in this debate as it should have been, and that is the contrast and the contradiction which the reciprocal-trade policy embodies.

Since I have been in Congress I have had the opportunity to support legislation aiming to increase the wages and reduce the hours and improve the working conditions of persons working in factories. As we look back over the years we find a constant improvement throughout American history in wages and in working conditions, going back to the early days in the textile mills when young girls were employed for long hours at a time for very small wages, and coming down to the conditions which today obtain in so many industries in which the hours are limited, and there is some kind of a minimum wage. I believe one of the most hopeful and one of the most inspiring things in our national history is the gradual improvement in the working conditions and the living conditions and the economic conditions of the average American citizen. It must be obvious to us all that goods manufactured under those conditions cost a great deal more than goods manufactured under sweatshop conditions, and that if we are going to try to build up the living conditions of our own people we simply cannot permit the entry of goods which are made by foreigners under definitely substandard conditions. There is a case in which we cannot ride two horses at once, because the two horses are going in opposite directions.

I understand that an amendment is to be offered to the pending joint resolution which will prevent the entry of goods produced under substandard labor conditions. I offered a similar amendment to the wage and hour bill when it was before the Senate. I certainly shall support the amendment in this instance. I think we have an absolutely hopeless contradiction here; that if we embrace the free-trade theory, the high-wage theory suffers, and if we embrace the high-wage philosophy, we are bound to restrict our foreign trade.

In this case there can be no doubt in the mind of anyone who studies the situation that the theory of raising wages and reducing hours is the one which is suffering and that the free-trade theory is in the ascendant in the conduct of our Government today. Of course, nobody is abandoning lip service to the ideal of high wages and shortened hours and better working conditions, but the fact remains that the extension of the free-trade principle is bound to be a hindrance to the extension of the high-wage principle.

Of course, the argument I have just made is criticized and attacked. Some say that it is the argument of isolationists. I have heard the word "isolationist" used a great deal on the floor of the Senate, and I have very seldom heard it defined. I do not know exactly what is meant by the appellation "isolationist." If the meaning is that an isolationist is a man who wants to protect his country from the bad influences of the outside world, then I say, yes; we are all isolationists. We ought to be. If an isolationist is a man who thinks it is easy for us to cut ourselves loose from the world, then, of course, no one but a fool would be an isolationist, because it is not easy. It seems to me it is desirable, however, for us to be as free as we possibly can from the dangerous influences which are at large in the world.

Of course, in the philosophy I am trying to describe there is no question of the United States moving to complete self-containment. That is a theoretical state of things which is just as impossible as a condition of complete free trade. The advocates of this joint resolution do not favor complete free trade any more than its opponents favor complete self-containment. There is a question of the direction in which we shall go, of the trend which we favor; and there is a legitimate question in my mind as to whether we, a vast continental nation with virtually limitless resources, should frame our trade policy as though we were a small island country which literally could not live without foreign trade.

There is a question of the trend which we follow, and what is that trend?

I respectfully submit that at present it is a trend toward increasing our trade relations with the armed camps of the world.

It is a trend which regards international trade as an end in itself, as something for which risks should be taken, for which men may even be called upon to die instead of merely viewing it for what it is, a useful economic tool.

It is a trend which assumes that nationalism is bad, which is a polite way of saying that patriotism is bad.

It is a trend which assumes that international trade promotes peace—an entirely unsupported and unsupportable assertion against which every counsel of experience and history stands in contradiction.

Indeed, wherever we turn we find that international trade is the cause of war rather than its preventer. It is certainly at the bottom of a great deal of the friction between Japan and China. It was certainly a factor in the rivalry between Germany and Great Britain in 1914, and it is certainly at the bottom of much of the trouble in Europe today. Certainly I think it is not at all extravagant to say that if international trade promotes peace and if the reciprocal trade-agreement policy promotes peace, the condition of Europe today is not a very convincing endorsement.

Prof. Charles A. Beard recently wrote an article, published in Harper's magazine, in which he listed some of the international wars which have taken place in the past century. Even though the list is quite long, I should like to read it into the Record. He lists the following:

- 1828-29, Russian war on Turkey.
- 1838-42, British war of Afghanistan.
- 1840, British opium war in China.
- 1845, British war in the Punjab.
- 1847, France finishes conquest of Algeria.
- 1854-56, England, France, Sardinia, and Turkey wage war on Russia.
- 1856-60, France and England wage war on China.
- 1859-60, France and Sardinia wage war on Austria.
- 1861, England, France, and Spain act against Mexico.
- 1864, Prussia attacks Denmark and seizes Schleswig-Holstein.
- 1866, German-Italian axis treaty; Germany wages war on Austria.
- 1870-71, Franco-Prussian War.
- 1877, Russia wages war on Turkey.
- 1881, France finishes conquest of Tunis.
- 1882, Italy makes an axis with Austria and Germany; British seize Cairo.
- 1883, France finishes conquest of Annam.
- 1885, France takes Tonkin from China by war; Serbo-Bulgarian war.
- 1895, Japan finishes war on China.
- 1896, Italian war on Abyssinia.
- 1897, Germany seizes Kiaochow in China.
- 1898, bloody uprising in Milan.
- 1899, Britain opens war on Boer republics.

Mr. President, that is the list of wars in the nineteenth century, and I think that any Senator who examines the list will have to admit in all candor that the desire for raw material, the desire for foreign markets, the desire to build up some kind of international commerce, played a very large part in every one of those wars, if not a decisive part, at least a very important and substantial part; and that whatever the economic advantages of the free-trade system may be, however secure its constitutional foundation may be, the contention that it promotes peace is unsupportable.

On the contrary, it seems to me that this policy would lead us to the conclusion that those who support it think that the good to be derived from foreign trade is so great as to justify a certain amount of risk. I tried to develop this point at the time the pending bill was being considered by the Committee on Finance, and I should like to read a brief extract describing a colloquy between the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and myself, which is found printed on page 152 of the hearings, as follows:

Senator LODGE. I said Great Britain, being an island and being dependent on foreign trade, naturally got involved in wars; that if you did not have the foreign trade you would get involved in wars just that much less.

Senator BARKLEY. You would just abolish foreign trade, then? You would just live on an island?

Senator LODGE. If you were single-minded about peace above everything else, that is what you would do.

Senator BARKLEY. If you were single-minded about peace and nothing else, all that you would have would be peace.

Senator LODGE. That is right. And it is better to be alive on a low living standard than to be rich and then get killed.

Senator BARKLEY. I would rather take a chance to keep alive by trade than to starve to death without it.

I congratulate the Senator from Kentucky on being so candid, so frank, because most people are not so candid and so frank. Most persons try to eat their cake and have it, too. They say, "Yes; we are going to have foreign trade, and ships all over the world, and navies to protect it, and we are going to have peace also." The Senator from Kentucky is very candid. He says, "I think foreign trade is such a good thing it is worth running some risk for."

That is a legitimate ground on which we can differ. That is his philosophy, and it is a very respectable one, but it is not a philosophy with which I agree. I think it points up this whole conflict, which to me seems very far reaching. It involves the philosophy of an America run for Americans, with the high-wage trend ever continuing. It involves the philosophy of having an internal situation which we can more or less control, and in which we can work out our own social reforms. It involves the question of having the United States keep out of foreign wars, walking a wide circle around them, and not getting into the frictions and involvements which are always caused by being dependent on foreign trade.

Mr. President, that is the real crux of this matter to me, and I humbly submit that it involves the whole American way of life, and involves the future of the American experiment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8641) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to provide supplemental appropriations for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, of late I have been receiving a good many communications which indicate to me that, while perhaps the Members of this body are familiar with the issues involved in the present debate, the citizen out on the farm, and in the village, and in the city, is very much confused. I have no idea of making any considerable contribution to the discussion of the issues here involved, but I do desire to state my position rather bluntly and plainly.

First. I believe everyone in this Chamber is in favor of fair, equitable trade agreements or treaties between this country and foreign nations.

Second. No one in this Chamber is against the principle of reciprocity embodied in such an agreement or treaty.

Third. A large group in this Chamber is in favor of the principle laid down in the Pittman amendment and the one which will be laid down later in the Adams amendment. Why? Because if the Supreme Court should hold that these agreements are not treaties, then we would have simply delegated the legislative power to the President to negotiate the agreements, and the Senate would pass upon them or renew them. Is there anything wrong about such a procedure?

If, on the other hand, the Supreme Court should hold that these agreements are treaties, then no harm would be done, because the President has the right to negotiate treaties and the Senate must then approve or disapprove them.

Fourth. If the Senate does not adopt the principle laid down in the Pittman amendment or a similar amendment, then a large group of Senators is not in favor of extending the legislative power to the President at this time. Why? Because of world conditions. If any reason not now apparent should become apparent in the future necessitating a change, of course Congress could be convened in extraordinary session, or Congress could at any regular session change its action.

Fifth. The best minds of America, I believe, should concentrate on American affairs instead of European affairs. The extensive trade we now have with Europe is not the result of these so-called reciprocal treaties, and when the war is over that trade will be gone. The best minds of America have a real job to attend to in this country. I refer to rehabilitating our farmers, getting jobs for youth, looking after the aged, extending and protecting the industrial life of the Nation, so that the unemployed and industry itself can get a break. All this must be done so that America will be equipped to meet the economic "blitzkrieg" which will inevitably follow the European war.

Mr. President, it is generally conceded that because of world conditions and because of America's virtual monopoly of gold the importance of reciprocal treaties, so-called, and their utility are constantly diminishing. Why? Because of foreign trade obstacles which virtually did not exist when Secretary Hull initiated the treaties. Straight tariffs do not count as they used to before the days of trade controls, export subsidies, barter agreements, exchange restrictions, exchange allotments, embargoes, currency blocs, and depreciated currencies.

The most-favored-nation policy, which we had much to do with, now operates in many instances to the detriment of our own industries and producers.

Mr. President, I believe that if the people of America were educated fully on these so-called trade barriers and informed further as to the effect of the so-called reciprocal-trade agreements on our economy, in that they are absolutely ineffectual to meet the new economic weapons forged by European governments because of economic conditions, the group now in favor of granting the additional power to the President would not be so insistent in their demands.

What I am getting at, bluntly, is that exchange quotas and controls, exchange restrictions imposed by foreign governments, discriminations by foreign governments, destruction of the structure of international prices, and depreciated currency, make the theory of reciprocal agreements unworkable. If that statement is correct, then all the argument that has been advanced is simply a smoke screen to hide the real purpose, which is to delegate to the Executive in these perilous times an additional power. My own thought is that the

Congress has already delegated to him too much power. The powers conferred upon him by the Constitution are ample. Congress should exercise its own powers, and I believe that is the wish of the people, especially after 7 years of trial and error.

Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to the dramatic appeal of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NORRIS), especially that part in which he claimed that if the pending measure should not become law there would be dire consequences to this Nation. Of course, what he said was simply an expression of opinion, and I value his opinion very highly, but I think in this particular he is very much mistaken.

What did he say the consequences would be?

He has assumed the following:

First. That the treaties would protect this Government in its dealings with foreign nations after the war was over.

Second. That the treaties would provide an instrument to put together the fragments and pieces of a torn and shattered civilization, or help to do so.

Third. If we should not pass the pending legislation we could not offer foreign nations adjustments of their tariff situation. He did not know what adjustments would be necessary.

Fourth. He asked the question: "Shall we be able to meet the situation with instrumentalities of government?"

Long before Secretary Hull started to operate his "reciprocity shop" America faced foreign situations. The President of the United States under the Constitution negotiated treaties and the Senate ratified them. Under the Constitution the President entered into agreements and compacts which were not treaties.

Mr. President, I do not like the tendency toward "Executive omniscience." It is bad business in Europe. It will be bad business here in the United States if put into effect. As I view the situation, we should not continue the authority in the President for the very reasons which became apparent from the argument of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Answering the distinguished Senator on his first point, I ask, How will a treaty negotiated now, a reciprocal treaty that fixes the tariff basis on imports from any other country, operate to protect this Government after the war, especially if the present tariff is 50 percent of the much maligned Smoot-Hawley tariff? The distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts brought forth the idea, which I now emphasize. Is it not strange that the Smoot-Hawley tariff, so much vilified by our Democratic friends, has not been repealed by them? It will be remembered that for 7 long years the Democrats have had control of both Houses, and they have done nothing to repeal that law. In other words, they have recognized that in the days that are ahead this law will be a great barrier against America becoming inundated with foreign imports which might paralyze our internal economy.

The second point made by the Senator from Nebraska was that the reciprocal treaties would provide an instrument to put together shattered Europe. My answer is that it will take more than a reciprocal treaty; it will take the great charitable heart of America and the rest of the world; it will take another Hoover, the great humanitarian, to look after broken-down humanity. It will take men with vision in America, whose hearts are in America and who will not sell out America under an emotional jag of pity—practical men, men who know how to rebuild and construct—not theorists, but men who realize that the future of the world depends upon keeping America safe under her republican form of government. It will also take a Europe reborn to the need of getting rid of her centuries of hate and national animosities.

As for the third point, we are told by the distinguished Senator that if we do not confer this power on the President we cannot offer foreign nations adjustments of their tariff situation. I take it what he means is that Congress would not be willing to take down the barrier. If that is what the senior Senator from Nebraska means, I believe he is correct. We cannot help Europe after the war by paralyzing our own industries or by selling out our own domestic trade.

For his fourth point the distinguished Senator asked the question:

Shall we be able to meet the situation with the instrumentalities of government?

This question implies that the power conferred upon the President to negotiate trade treaties would be a very significant instrument of government in the post-war years. I doubt the correctness of that conclusion. Let us get this question straight. The President, without this power, may negotiate treaties. We believe in having fair dealings with all nations that will deal with us fairly; but I believe the Senator, in his ardent advocacy of the measure, has blinded himself to the realities.

If we do not pass the joint resolution we shall not interfere with the right of the duly constituted authorities to negotiate commercial treaties, or with the right of the Executive, within his field, to enter into agreements or compacts. All we are doing is saying that for the time being we feel it unwise to extend this legislative power to the President.

A trade treaty implies that the two nations have something to trade. It must be conceded that any agreement with a war-racked nation, involving the importation of foreign goods in competition with American goods, should have not only the serious consideration of the experts in the State Department—who themselves are not immune to logrolling or influence—but in these critical times should be reviewed by the constitutional authority—the Senate.

On Friday the distinguished Senator from Nebraska claimed that to give the President this power was common sense. I asked him this question:

I am wondering whether it is not common sense to adopt the Pittman amendment, which would virtually make the Senate a board of review as to the merits of any agreement or treaty?

His answer was, in substance, that for the Senate to retain that power would kill the whole measure "as dead as a doornail."

I cannot agree with the Senator in that conclusion. I believe that the people of this country have the same opinion about the Senate that Webster had when, on March 7, 1850, he said:

It is fortunate that there is a Senate of the United States; a body not yet moved from its propriety, not lost to a just sense of its own dignity and its own high responsibilities, and a body to which this country looks with confidence for wise, moderate, patriotic, and healing counsels.

Mr. President, when did the executive branch of this Government become so dependable, and the Senate of the United States so undependable, that the Senate must delegate its powers to the Executive? Since becoming a Member of the United States Senate a year and 3 months ago, I have become very well acquainted with a number of my colleagues. I believe they are dependable men. I further believe that most of them are men who have graduated from the "university of hard knocks"—practical men, men with ideals and ideas. In this particular period I believe that the combined views of these men, who come from different sections of this great Nation, would provide a better standard to tie to than the judgment of the Executive or the State Department. Why? Because we have our feet on the ground. We are mixing daily with the common man, whom Abraham Lincoln said God Almighty must have loved because he made so many of them. Our eyes are not continually fixed on the "mirage of foreign trade." We know the problems of our constituents, and they know and we know that under present world conditions trade treaties will not provide a panacea for the economic ills within our own borders.

Mr. President, it has been said a number of times that since the passage of the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, we have entered into 22 reciprocal-trade pacts, and that only 3 of those pacts were not required to be ratified by legislative action of the foreign nations. Under what strange spell have we in America fallen, that we listen to the siren voice which suggests that the Senate of the United States should delegate its powers because it does not know what is for the welfare or best interests of our people?

Mr. President, in the history of Israel, there was a time when its people worshipped the golden calf. It was hung aloft so that the people could see it. In this argument there are those who have indicated a worship of the golden calf of legislation. I know that the word "reciprocity" has hypnotized many of our people. It has been hung aloft, and every virtue has been attributed to trade treaties. In spite of all the evidence to the contrary, partisans are almost willing to say that every virtue is tied to them. If we could strip off the veneer of this golden calf, we should find that there is nothing magical in trade treaties. The present discussion involves only the question whether or not we want to delegate to the Executive for the next 3 years the significant powers which have been discussed—powers involving treaties, taxation, and revenue. Personally, I believe that if they are delegated they will not be used because of the uncertainty of conditions and currencies abroad and because of the situation of agriculture and business within our own borders. Later, I shall have something further to say as to the workability of trade treaties during and after the World War.

Mr. President, the economic life of the Nation is built upon domestic and foreign trade. We are informed that our foreign trade does not exceed 10 percent of our total trade. Ever since the inception of this Government, our policy in relation to foreign trade has been of great significance in directing our progress.

The Tariff Act of 1789 was the first tariff legislation passed under the Constitution. Down through the years we have had our tariff squabbles. We have had great debates in Congress on the merits of the protective- and the free-trade systems.

The protective tariff had as its primary purpose building up American industry and making America an industrial Nation—a Nation producing manufactured products from raw materials, and in so doing creating good jobs.

We could spend hours in going into the "pros and cons" of the value of a protective tariff. We could bring into the discussion what the lowering of the tariff would do to the American standard of living. We could also bring into the discussion the arguments on behalf of free trade. But this would do us no particular good at this time, because the subject under discussion is the continuity of the new tariff procedure which was brought into being in 1934 largely through the efforts of Cordell Hull, the Secretary of State. I refer to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, which, for a period of 3 years, through the Department of State, gave to the President power to negotiate reciprocal-trade agreements with other nations, the idea being that such treaties or agreements would add impetus and volume to international trade, and in so doing stimulate our own trade and markets. As every Senator knows, the idea behind giving the President this authority was that by such agreements we could expand foreign markets for the products of the United States.

The delegation of authority to the President to change tariff rates, with the consent of the Senate, is not a new matter in our history. In 1897 the Dingley Act was passed, authorizing the President to negotiate similar agreements covering a limited group of imports. I am informed that both President Theodore Roosevelt and President McKinley negotiated agreements with a number of foreign countries under the Dingley Act; but all those reciprocal treaties received the approval of the Senate.

Under the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922 the President was authorized to increase or decrease duties on any particular article when, on the basis of an investigation by the Tariff Commission, he found that the existing duties did not equal the difference between the costs of production in the United States and in the competing country.

As we all know, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expired in 1937, at which time Congress renewed it for another 3 years. So today the question is, Shall we renew this authority of the President, or shall we amend the act to require Senate approval, or shall we defer action until the world again becomes sane?

Mr. President, I am not finding fault with the idea of reciprocal-trade treaties or agreements. Secretary Hull did not originate the idea. It came out of experience. In it is contained much common sense. This is a large country, a country of many sections, with a diversity of crops, a country of many mineral resources. Industrially and agriculturally, it is the most nearly self-sufficient country on the face of the globe—which means that we produce almost everything. When we trade or sell some of our products to foreign countries, they sell back to us products which compete with our home production. The idea is that by selling more of our goods we create more opportunities for labor. By adding economic flow to the economic current we contribute toward prosperity.

But unfortunately in many instances, as Senators have shown, the trade treaties have not operated in that way. The agreements are the result of human minds meeting—a group in the State Department and representatives of foreign nations—and, of course, the human mind is fallible. Therefore, in treaties such as that with Canada an escape clause or clauses provided in substance that either country, if it found that under the agreement domestic production of the article concerned was injuriously affected, or if a wide variation occurred in the rate of exchange between currencies, might take action to remedy that situation.

However, I invite attention to a challenging fact. I am informed that in these agreements more than a thousand commodities have been considered, but so infallible have been the master minds which negotiated the treaties that no advantage has been taken of the escape clause or clauses. Here, I believe, we have the reason for much of the opposition to the treaties. In other words, the servant has fallen asleep on the job. We know that a number of conferences have been held by the State Department at the instance of producers of this country. Remember, these producers are American citizens with rights and privileges. One of the great rights of a citizen is the right to petition his Government, and it is the obligation of the servant—the employee of Government—to pay attention when the citizen speaks. Yet out of all these hearings there has come no admission, even in one instance, that the State Department has been wrong.

After a great deal of pressure, a supplementary agreement was entered into with Canada with relation to fox furs, and a ceiling of 100,000 was placed on the number of fox furs that could be imported. That ceiling is much more than the normal importation, with the result that while it stopped a total inundation it did permit a partial one, with the result that in that industry American citizens have lost much money. My own State has been seriously affected.

Let us be frank about the whole situation. We are living in a topsy-turvy world; and if we are to continue the present trade policy—as it appears we are, because word has gone out from the White House to continue it—we must safeguard our American position so as to avoid any treaty arrangement which, under the direction of some State Department experts, will mutilate some of our American industries and further injure our farmers.

I have no personal feeling toward the employees of government—I myself am one—but I do have a feeling against some of the high-flying theorists, many of whom have never earned a dollar by the sweat of the brow, and who are always anxious to experiment with other people's money but not with their own. I have heard some of them argue that the thing to do would be to reduce all tariff barriers and let the goods of all the countries flow into the United States. In view of the topsy-turvy world we are in, let us proceed cautiously in reducing tariff rates. Some of us believe that is the Senate's business.

As I have said, a large majority of the present so-called reciprocal treaties were required to be approved by the legislative bodies of other nations. This fact should cause us to pause, especially in these times, when we see the executive arm in other nations taking all the power. If this law is to be continued, it must be borne in mind that it does not present

a situation giving the President power in relation to specific items, but it gives him blanket authority to negotiate agreements relative to everything produced in this country.

The purpose of extension of our trade and commerce is a beneficial one; but to delegate that job to the Executive at this time might result in the diminution of our trade and commerce. We know that trade wars are unprofitable and that good will and friendly trade relations are much desired. Is not every Senator interested in furthering such trade and commerce? Some of us feel that under the fundamental law of the land it is the function of the Senate, after the President has formulated a treaty affecting the commercial interest of our people, to approve or disapprove such treaty or agreement.

Mr. President, there is nothing sacrosanct, mysterious, or obnoxious in the word "reciprocity." However, there is much misunderstanding of the real issues involved in this debate. There is an old saying that "figures don't lie, but liars will figure." In these times it has become the custom to do two things to sustain one's position: First, get together a lot of figures or statistics; second, get a group of experts on one's side.

As I see the situation, we need neither of these factors to back up either position taken in this debate. Why? Because, in the first place, when the figures which are produced for or against the reciprocal-trade treaties are examined, they cannot be said to be conclusive proof of the contentions made. The reason is that so many other factors are involved. I have already mentioned some of them—world unrest, war, currency instability, and so forth.

Secondly, we do not need the experts, because they are partisans who draw their conclusions from the figures which they produce to sustain their position.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note how many distinguished Senators have changed front on this issue, although I must say that the experts and the figures have had nothing to do with the change. The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] showed that a number of Democratic Senators—including the present Secretary of State—opposed the policy embodied in the joint resolution when the Republicans were in power.

This change is unimportant, except that it seems to me that, after all, politics appears to play a part in fundamental matters as well as in superficial matters. I was interested in the remarks of the junior Senator from Nevada today on that very issue. He said that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act would not have been passed had it not been definitely understood that there would be no change in the excise duties on copper and other commodities. I cannot conceive how Senators who would be against the idea of giving the President power to negotiate agreements of this kind in times of peace can now favor giving him this power in a time of great world crisis.

Mr. President, if the question were simply an academic one—Do you favor reciprocal treaties or agreements between nations?—I believe we could answer that question generally in this way: We believe in fair dealing between fair men; we believe in fair dealing between nations which want to deal honorably and fairly, but we believe also that this Government, in its foreign economic policy, must give realistic consideration to the situation which now obtains throughout the world.

Let us keep clearly in mind the point that until the advent of the present administration every reciprocal treaty was approved by the Senate. If, in times of peace, such reciprocal agreements or treaties worked beneficially to the contracting parties, but were required to be confirmed or ratified by the Senate, I ask, Is there not more reason than ever, in these troubled times, for treaties which affect the economic life of this Nation to have the approval of the Senate or Congress?

In approaching this problem, we must analyze it coolly, with the idea foremost in our thoughts of safeguarding America and American interests.

Mr. President, only yesterday there appeared in the press something which I do not believe, something which I believe

is the result of Nazi propaganda. However, it is pertinent to the subject I am discussing. In approaching this problem we must bear in mind, first and foremost, the safeguarding of America and American interests. I cannot believe that our representatives abroad, or the President in this country, made any such commitment as was intimated in the dispatches from Berlin; but I do know that in this country of ours there are those who are so shot through with their interest in foreign affairs that their eyes are blinded to American affairs. If those men hold office, then, in the words of a gentleman from the other body, they should be "brought to time." This country is our heritage; this is our mint to look after, and we had better not become involved in looking after foreign problems. So, Mr. President, I repeat that in approaching this problem we have to analyze it coolly, with the idea foremost in our thoughts of safeguarding America and American interests. Having this thought in mind and applying it does not make us less constructive in our relations with the rest of the world. The security and the welfare of the American people should be first. We realize, especially under normal circumstances, that we must seek to develop trade with other nations.

But, I repeat, Europe and Asia are at war. Force rules nations. Treaties are disregarded. Perhaps we are seeing a change in the world order. The balance of power is in the balance. We must also realize that in this changing world there appears to be more and more contempt for democratic processes—yes; for democratic ideas. With what result? The rules of the game are changing. I mean the political and economic rules applicable to international relations. No one can doubt this statement.

If, in 1934 and 1937, before the world went mad, Congress thought it advisable to give the President the power to negotiate all reciprocal agreements or treaties, that is no reason why that power should be continued. The power was given before Mars had raised his fiery head, before President Roosevelt had made his Chicago speech, and there are now 22 treaties, or reciprocal agreements, in force which will continue to be in force until either one or both of the nations who are parties thereto elect, under the terms of the treaties, to abrogate them.

In spite of all the propaganda—and there has been plenty of it on both sides—I think this whole matter can be simplified. The human mind has a tendency to complicate everything coming within its grasp. I take it that every Senator has had communications from this group and that group, indicating that someone has asked them to write letters requesting Senators to support the President's bill or not to support it. What is the nature of the pending joint resolution? It simply provides:

Resolved, etc., That the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the act (Public, No. 316, 73d Cong.) approved June 12, 1934, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1940.

It will be noticed that the joint resolution does not even mention that most significant word "reciprocal"; it merely uses the words "foreign trade agreements." Yet the whole propaganda in favor of this program has been built around the word "reciprocity." Everywhere, in every little country town, in every village and every organization the suggestion has been "support the reciprocity agreements," and that is the way it comes to Washington.

As all the Senators know, there is a question whether these agreements are treaties within the provision of article II, section 2, of the Constitution which provides:

He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Is the Trade Agreements Act constitutional? There has been so much said on that subject that I shall not spend a great deal of time on it; but it appears to me it all depends on whether or not the Supreme Court shall say that these instruments which we are trying to give the President power to go ahead and negotiate are treaties or are merely agreements. Bearing in mind the provision of the Constitution just read, it seems to me that if we pass this measure we are

attempting to delegate to the President power which we cannot delegate.

Then there is the objection that under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act the President is given authority to raise or lower duties by 50 percent, but the act provides no standard to guide the Executive. I understand that amendments are to be offered which will provide standards. If such amendments should be attached to the bill, the objection to which I have alluded would be obviated. The Supreme Court has held that the delegation of power by Congress without adequate standards is unconstitutional. The argument of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin], to which I listened the other day, seems to me to be absolutely unanswerable and unanswered. The House has seen fit, in its vote on this measure, to abandon to the President its functions of initiating revenue laws, but Congress cannot delegate the constitutional provision with regard to treaties.

That brings to mind the question, Why has not the act been declared unconstitutional by the Court during the last 6 years? That question has been asked on the floor of the Senate. Here it appears the act itself denies the manufacturer or producer the remedy allowed by section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, and no one could probably prove an injury because of a reduced duty which was not common to the people generally. That is the answer to the question.

It is claimed that the history of these treaties in the last 6 years demonstrates clearly the value of the program, in that it is said that there has been a 97-percent increase in our export trade from 1932 to 1939.

On the other hand, it is claimed by those who oppose the continuance of this power that our exports increased primarily as a result of world recovery and would have taken place if the trade-agreements program had not been put into effect.

That brings up the question of what this program has done for industry.

Figures issued by the Department of Commerce show that agricultural exports in 1939 were 1 percent below agricultural exports in 1932, the bottom year of the depression, although over this same period exports of United States merchandise increased 98 percent. We also find that agricultural exports in 1939 were 12 percent below agricultural exports in 1935. So, apparently, if we take the figures as a basis, the program has not benefited the farmer.

The fact that agricultural surpluses have accumulated shows that the farmer has not been getting any benefit from these treaties. Furthermore, the facts show that with countries with whom we have had treaties, exports have increased but four and one-half times, while from 1935 to 1938 exports to nontreaty countries increased nearly nine times. Our foremost important export agricultural products are cotton, tobacco, wheat, and pork. From 1935 to 1938 exports of hams, shoulders, and bacon to countries with whom we had treaties actually declined 9.5 percent, while exports to other countries with whom we had no treaties increased 4.6 percent; and in the case of cotton, from 1935 to 1938 our exports declined 22 percent.

One of the purposes of the act was to regulate the admission of foreign goods into the United States "in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production." Has this been carried out?

I feel that this language, so far as my State of Wisconsin is concerned, has been forgotten. Does this country need to import meat, milk, butter, cream, and cheese? Is there need for the importation of fox furs? Or do we fail to produce enough of these things to satisfy our home demand? The answer is an emphatic "No." We know that the dairy farmer needs the American market. The fox-fur farmers need the American market.

In general, I feel that the Department of State has not done the job it could have done. It has not exercised, in many instances, where it should have done so, its rights under the escape clauses. It has made agreements that relate to over a thousand items, and yet it has not seen fit to admit that it was wrong in any case. If this act should be continued in force, as I presume it will be, I think that some consideration

should be given to helping those who might be injured by the operation of the act.

There is no question that the reciprocity agreements have benefited certain groups in our economy—that is, the foreign trade has benefited them—and there is no question that it has harmed other groups. This is due probably to the fact that we are a large nation and produce a great variety of things. We are the most self-sufficient Nation on earth.

Mr. President, what would happen if the President's power to negotiate so-called reciprocal-trade agreements should not be extended? Well, the present agreements would continue unimpaired; and there are, I believe, 22 in existence. The President's power, however, would not be curtailed to negotiate any new treaties. If we should not extend the President's power under the Trade Agreements Act, he could negotiate just the same. The only difference would be that the treaties or agreements thus negotiated would have to come back to the Senate for ratification or rejection.

Then there is the so-called Norris argument that we should confer the power upon the President so that if in the future there should be an opportunity to make effective agreements he should be in a position to do so. I have partially answered that argument, but, answering it further, let me say that it seems to me we must realize that under the Trade Agreements Act the President is given the power to reduce the tariff rate, but once a trade treaty becomes operative, it has, because of the favored-nation clause, the effect of giving other nations the right to the same reduction of tariff rates.

I remember that the other day the effect of that clause was very clearly illustrated by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who showed how Russia got the benefit of a most-favored-nation clause in a treaty we negotiated with another nation. There are numerous instances of the way in which that clause works, and it works detrimentally to American producers.

The future holds some very difficult problems. I wish everyone in this country would realize this fact, especially the persons who are going to have something to do about getting America interested in dealing with foreign nations after the war is over. When the war is over our market, which is the best market in the world, will be the target for every nation, if we permit it.

I should like to see the State Department concentrate upon protective measures that will protect America against the onslaughts of the future trade of these nations. The trade wars of the future will present plenty of problems for us to solve. Europe, without credit or gold, will have to barter with us. Whether we like it or not, because we are living in a neighborhood world, we shall have to adopt some of the self-sufficiency ideas of the Old World.

Much was said today by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] which applies directly to that point. I want Senators to bear in mind that no one has claimed at any time that our maximum foreign trade ever exceeded 10 percent of our total trade; and yet we are talking all the time about protecting the 10 percent. Ten percent. What about thinking a little bit of how to protect the 90 percent?

These are questions which cannot be answered by statistics for or against trade agreements. Statistics are valuable if they are properly utilized; but we cannot use statistics as a yardstick to measure the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a trade treaty when we know that the results obtained are the product of many factors, such as war with its changed demands, drought, flood, gold purchases, change in labor costs, material costs, change in tariff walls, blockades, new methods of production, and so forth. Therefore we must not be misled, as so many persons seem to permit themselves to be, by statistics, because they are inadequate and misleading.

That brings us to another consideration. What about the war situation and the economic situation in Europe? Will they have any influence on the reciprocity treaties?

The warring powers with which we have had treaties have exercised their right under the treaties to do that which they could not do under the treaties in case they were at peace. However, the situation will be far more serious after the war. We all know that Europe's gold will be here in America, and

a great deal of the Allies' American investments will have returned home. After the war we may find all nations doing what Germany has had to do—engage in barter.

The war is forcing Great Britain and France into the same kind of an economy that Germany is in. If Germany should win the war, the situation would be bad indeed. All we have to do to appreciate the truth of this statement is to realize the kind of peace that would be imposed upon the vanquished. Look at Czechoslovakia and Poland and Finland. We have already said to England and France and the rest of the world that we want gold or its equivalent, and nothing else. No foreign nation will have gold, so we may expect ruthless competition, even such as Germany has been carrying on, in all the markets of the world. Then, if we are dependent upon foreign trade, we shall be in a bad fix, because our economy with high labor costs and with high prices free from Government control will have to compete in a world of totalitarian economics based on controlled wages, government-fixed and adjusted prices, currency managed internationally, and trade by barter. The question is whether or not a reciprocity-agreement policy can be effective in any degree under such circumstances. I have not heard that argument met on this floor, nor have I read anywhere that anyone has attempted to argue that the policy would be effective at such a time.

My suggestion is that we quit fiddling around, quit thinking so much about foreign conditions, and realize that we have a great opportunity to put our house in order domestically. We have to consider, of course, world economic realities, but we must also count our own blessings and utilize all the economic values that we have in the Western Hemisphere.

I repeat, the principle of reciprocity is sound, but it is only as sound as that embodied in any other trade. If you go into a store and trade your dollar for an article that is worth the dollar, you have engaged in a reciprocal or mutual transaction. Such a deal is fair, and both parties benefit by it. Not only the storekeeper, but the manufacturer and the laborer in America who produced the article have benefited. But if you go into a store and buy an article not manufactured in America—an article which could be manufactured here, and an article which comes into direct competition with one manufactured in America—you have, unless there is some compensating benefit, interfered with the American workman who could produce the domestic product; you have interfered with the factory; and it may be that you bought the article for 90 cents because it was produced abroad at a cheaper labor cost and a cheaper material cost, with the result that even the American concern had to sell its product down to 90 cents. I know this is not a complete analogy, but it has more than a grain of truth in it.

Yes, Mr. President, foreign trade is important, but it is not so important that we should lose our perspective; or, putting the matter in the vernacular of the street, we should not, because of our foreign trade, lose the coat, vest, and pants of our domestic trade.

Judging by the vote on Friday, it seems likely that the measure we are discussing will become law. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, and I realize that it is dangerous to engage in the role of a prophet; but I am going to take the risk. I am going to hazard a few guesses as to what the results will be. They are as follows:

First. During the war no appreciable damage or benefit will result from the extension of the power of the President.

Second. If the war ceases within the 3 years, and then the power is exercised by the President, considerable damage will result to our own economy if new treaties are entered into by a President who is free-trade-minded or foreign-minded.

Third. Many of the present treaties will have to be abrogated or amended after the war, and even before the war ceases, to protect our economy.

Mr. President, I conclude as follows:

First. I believe we should not attempt to delegate to the President the treaty power, the tariff power, and the internal taxing power.

Second. We should not keep on conferring more power on the Executive. The people want this march toward economic dictatorship by the President stopped. It was never contemplated by the founders of the Republic that the Executive should have other than executive power.

Third. By refusing to pass this joint resolution in these perilous and changing times, the Senate will serve notice on America that we are aware of our high responsibilities, and that very act will open the door for a return of confidence and economic healing.

During the delivery of Mr. WILEY's address:

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONNALLY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. A statement was recently made on the floor of the Senate with respect to the time consumed in the consideration of the tariff law. It was said that it consumed practically the whole session.

I note on page 3674 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 29, 1940, that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] interrupted the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to remind him and the Senate that the present tariff law was begun in the House of Representatives in December 1923 and was passed and signed finally by the President in June 1930, taking 19 months, in the two Houses, to write a tariff law.

The object of this interruption was to point to the possibility of great time consumption should we make mandatory the submission of tariff trade agreements to the Senate for ratification.

The Senator from Kentucky, however, did not tell us that during the 19 months he said elapsed between the inception and approval of that act, Congress in the same period, and in addition to the Tariff Act, passed 89 private acts, 109 public resolutions, and 378 public acts. Neither did he indicate the relatively small number of items in a trade agreement when placed in comparison with a major revision of the tariff, with its thousands of items and its highly controversial administrative features, nor the 235 yea-and-nay votes in the Senate alone, all of which constitute a magnitude that no trade agreement could possibly attain.

The Trade Agreement Act was approved June 12, 1934, and it has taken nearly 6 years to negotiate and put into effect 22 agreements; and the total of items negotiated does not approach the number in the Tariff Act of 1930.

The comparison chosen by the Senator from Kentucky—the Tariff Act of 1930—was not entirely appropriate, for that legislation was made the target of attack by the Democratic Party to a greater extent than any prior act. Senators will recall the "smear" campaign against it by a highly paid Democratic specialist; and they will recall that after the bill had been pending in the Senate for 6 months, the then Senator from Utah, Mr. Smoot, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1930, on page 4612, a statement of time consumed on the tariff bill, which I will read:

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection I send to the desk and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD the result of an examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from September 4, 1929, the date on which the pending tariff bill was reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, to February 25, 1930. That examination discloses approximately 2,638 pages containing the actual debate on the tariff bill. Of this total, the space in the RECORD is divided approximately as follows:

Democrats, 1,108 pages.
Republicans, 791½ pages.
Insurgents, 738½ pages.

The Official Reporters of the Senate state that each page in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represents approximately 12 minutes of debate. Thus expressed, the relative amount of time consumed by each group during the period mentioned is set forth in the statement, which I ask to be printed entire in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement entire is as follows:

"An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from September 4, 1929, the date the pending tariff bill (H. R. 2667) was reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, to February 25, 1930, discloses that approximately 2,638 pages contain the actual debate on the tariff bill.

"Of this total, the space is divided approximately as follows:

"Democrats, 1,108 pages.

"Republicans, 791½ pages.

"Insurgents, 738½ pages."

"The Official Reporters of the Senate state that each page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represents approximately 12 minutes of debate. Thus expressed, the relative amount of time consumed by each group during the period above mentioned is as follows: Democrats, 221 hours, or 42 percent; Republicans, 158 hours, or 30 percent; insurgents, 148 hours, or 28 percent."

The chronological history of the Tariff Act of 1930 (H. R. 2667) is as follows:

Ways and Means hearings, January 7, 1929, to February 25, 1929.

Introduced in House and referred, May 7, 1929.

Reported to House, May 9, 1929.

Passed the House, May 28, 1929.

Received and referred in Senate, May 29, 1929.

Reported to the Senate, September 4, 1929.

Passed the Senate, March 24, 1930.

Conference report adopted in Senate, June 13, 1930.

Conference report adopted in House, June 14, 1930.

Approved by the President, June 17, 1930.

I thought the Senator from Wisconsin would like to have the history of the debate and the time consumed in the consideration of the Smoot-Hawley tariff measure.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I am sure he has done a real job.

After the conclusion of Mr. WILEY's speech—

WHITE BOOK PUBLISHED BY GERMAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have listened with interest, as I always do, to what the able junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] had to say; but I was particularly interested in the portion of his address in which he digressed to mention a situation which has arisen within the past several days as a result of the publication of the so-called White Papers.

Mr. President, in my opinion the publication of the so-called White Book by the German Government imposes a very definite duty upon the Senate, regardless of our individual opinions as to the authenticity of the documents reproduced therein.

I believe we here have a duty to perform because Mr. Bullitt is Ambassador to France by virtue of the fact that upon the recommendation of the President we voted to confirm his nomination. The same state of facts applies to Mr. Kennedy, our Ambassador to the Court of St. James's. Let me add also, Mr. President, that not so long ago we confirmed the nomination of Mr. Cromwell as Minister to Canada; and recently Mr. Cromwell publicly stated substantially the same things that Mr. Bullitt and Mr. Kennedy are alleged to have privately stated, according to the Polish documents published by the German Government.

In my opinion it is our immediate business to institute a searching inquiry into the conversations of Mr. Bullitt and Mr. Kennedy. Mr. Bullitt is here in the United States. Before he takes the plane for Europe, I suggest that he be required to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and testify under oath as to the truth or falsity of the serious allegations made by the German Government. If the State Department demands it, let the examination of Mr. Bullitt be conducted behind closed doors, but examine him we should. The American people are entitled to all obtainable information pertaining to these charges.

In connection with this examination, let us request the State Department to supply us with authenticated copies of the public addresses made by Mr. Bullitt and Mr. Kennedy, and also by Mr. Cromwell.

Mr. President, we cannot ignore this incident. The parents of the boys who some think must die on foreign battlefields to finish other people's wars are going to hold us responsible if we do not take appropriate action to correct a menacing situation.

The most deplorable fact about this matter is that even if the documents published in the German White Paper are branded as forgeries, or possibly proved to be forgeries, any man can say, and many are already saying, that these interviews, or alleged interviews, sound very much like many things

we have heard over the radio from many people in high office from time to time. That cannot be denied.

For example, on October 5, 1937, the President made an address in which he said:

The peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort in opposition to those violations of treaties and those ignorings of humane instincts which today are creating a state of international anarchy and instability from which there is no escape through mere isolation or neutrality.

That statement, Mr. President, was a clear and precise expression of opinion that the United States cannot escape involvement in an European controversy through isolation or neutrality.

The President said further, in the same speech:

There is a solidarity and an interdependence about the modern world, both technically and morally, which makes it impossible for any nation completely to isolate itself from economic and political upheavals in the rest of the world, especially when such upheavals appear to be spreading and not declining.

And again, the President said:

I am compelled and you are compelled, nevertheless, to look ahead. The peace, the freedom, and the security of 90 percent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining 10 percent who are threatening a break-down of all international order and law. Surely the 90 percent who want to live in peace under law and in accordance with moral standards which have received almost universal acceptance through the centuries, can and must find some way to make their will prevail.

Now, Mr. President, although the Secretary of State has repudiated any association with the policies which it is alleged our diplomats sponsored in conversations, he cannot escape the logical conclusions which must be drawn from a paragraph in his letter of September 2, 1938, to the Foreign Minister of Peru. Let me read what he said on that date:

Events in other parts of the world have emphasized recently the extent to which some nations have wavered from the orderly and friendly relations which should prevail between neighbors. The nations of the world are faced with the issue of determining whether relations shall be characterized by international anarchy and lawlessness or by the principles of fair play, justice, and order under law. No nation and no government can avoid the issue; neither can any nation avoid participation, willing or not, in the responsibility of determining which course of action shall prevail.

Mr. President, there is an unfortunate misconception in the minds of many people that the executive branch of the Government has unlimited power to conduct the foreign relations of the United States as it sees fit. The fact of the matter is that the Constitution of the United States, by the first section of article I, conferred all legislative powers upon the Congress, which it decrees should consist of the Senate and House of Representatives. The Constitution confers the sole power on the Congress to declare war, in subsection 2 of section 8 of article I. That tells the story. The Congress alone has the power to involve the Nation in war. And note well the final subsection of this section 8. Let me read it.

The Congress shall have power * * * To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

Mr. President, it is hardly necessary for me to pile proof upon proof that the Congress is the master of all executive agencies of this Government. But let me point out as a final word on this particular point that the very fact that the Constitution provides, in article II, section 2, that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, demonstrates conclusively our right to participate in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States.

Mr. President, I take it that no one in this body will deny that the Congress of the United States is the voice of the people, subject only to the limitation that all powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States and to the people.

The American people are jarred by the revelations in these documents. As I have said before, unfortunately it is impossible to dissociate them, whether they be true or false, from public pronouncements by many officials or the executive

branch of our Government. The American people want to keep out of war. The people want to be assured that neither this administration nor any succeeding administration will lead them into war by surreptitious engagements or otherwise. We have the power, Mr. President, to give this reassurance. I call upon my colleagues to join with me in the assertion of our prerogative to control the destiny of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 238) disclaiming intention of the Government to interfere in international controversies or domestic concerns of European, Asiatic, or African powers, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Government of the United States disclaims any desire or intention to interfere in the international controversies or domestic concerns of any European, Asiatic, or African power, and will recognize the de facto government in control of any area therein located as the legitimate government of that area, and will seek to promote friendly intercourse therewith, provided such government respects the rights of American citizens, observes good faith in its international relations, and refrains from any attempt to extend its territory, system of government, or political ideology to any portion of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is entirely unnecessary for me to consume the time of this body to bring to its attention, or to the attention of the individual Members thereof, the gravity of the situation which now exists, particularly that pertaining to the United States of America, because for several days headlines on the front pages of virtually every newspaper in the United States have appeared over articles relative thereto. In addition, I may add, there have been innumerable editorials pertaining to the controversy which is raging now as to the truth or falsity of the allegations made by the German Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Without objection, the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know, by way of record, by way of a congressional inquiry, by way of statements made under oath, as to whether or not the statements made by the German Government are to be believed, as to whether or not statements made by the German Government are false or true.

In substantiation of the great amount of publicity that this matter has been given, I ask to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at this point, an article entitled "United States Envoys' Activities Are Criminal, Nazis Say."

Of course, the American people make denial of that statement, but we make denial of it upon the assumption that no representatives of ours would deal with or indulge in conversations such as revealed by the White Book released by the German Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of April 1, 1940]

UNITED STATES ENVOYS' ACTIVITIES ARE CRIMINAL, NAZIS SAY
BERLIN, April 1.—The Diplomatic and Political Correspondence, German Foreign Office newspaper, which joined in an angry press campaign, today said activities of American diplomatic representatives in Europe, as alleged in an official White Book, had been "dangerous and even criminal."

"It is surprising, and even monstrous," said the publication, "that official diplomatic representatives of a power which fundamentally since Washington and Monroe, has opposed interference in the affairs of foreign countries were irresponsible enough to stimulate the danger of conflict between third powers."

"TRAGIC IN EFFECT"

"Tragic in their effect are the reports of Polish diplomats to Warsaw regarding the readiness of American diplomats, by intervention in London, to close up existing gaps."

"The methods of these American amateur diplomats are all the more inconceivable since the neutrality laws of their country must have told them that their actions were diametrically opposed to the standpoint of their country."

"The willfulness of these representatives, which cannot be excused solely on the grounds of dilettantism, and which has caused unending damages to Berlin in the past, remains a factor with which foreign nations, and also the American people, must reckon."

MORE HEADLINES

Newspapers continued to display sensationally the allegations in the White Book which the foreign office published as representing diplomatic papers found in Polish archives in Warsaw after the German occupation.

Voelkischer Beobachter, official Nazi Party newspaper, centered its attack on William C. Bullitt, American Ambassador to France. On page 1 it printed an article with the headline: "Bullitt's shattered plan: War between Germany and Russia followed by English, French, and American attack from the rear on weakened Germany."

Mr. REYNOLDS. In order that the situation may be clear for those who do me the honor to listen and for the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask that there be published at this point in the RECORD a very excellent article from the pen of W. A. Hildebrand, the Washington correspondent of the Daily News of Greensboro, N. C., bearing date March 30, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

REYNOLDS WILL ASK PROBE OF NAZI CHARGES
(By W. A. Hildebrand)

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of North Carolina, a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and likewise active in the work of the Military Affairs Committee, was in Paris last September 3 when at 11 o'clock in the forenoon Great Britain declared war on Germany, the Polish affair having served as the casus belli, and France issued mobilization orders a few hours later.

Predicating his view on what he saw and heard upon that historic occasion, Senator REYNOLDS is persuaded that, in fairness to the American people, the current disclosures by the publishers of the German White Book should be made the subject of a thorough and prompt Senate investigation.

THOROUGH INQUIRY

Senator REYNOLDS feels that this should be done, and a thoroughgoing inquiry made without reference to the developments in Berlin, where it is declared that another and more sensational chapter will presently be made available which will establish beyond question the accuracy and authenticity of the documents seized from Polish foreign office files when the Germans entered Warsaw. According to the alleged documentary evidence the American Ambassador to France, William E. Bullitt, and the Ambassador to England, Joseph Kennedy, were guilty of what the Nazis call warmongering, that Bullitt in particular encouraged Poland to refuse a settlement of the Danzig and the Polish Corridor problems by peaceful negotiation, and implied in frequent conversations that this country would participate in any war that Great Britain and France might see fit to start. Bullitt is now preparing to return to his Paris post, but Senator REYNOLDS thinks he should be required to remain here for questioning by a Senate committee.

SHOULD BROADEN SCOPE

At the instance of Senator CLARK of Missouri, the Foreign Relations Committee has reported out a resolution designed to insure an inquiry into foreign propaganda, but Senator REYNOLDS thinks the scope of this inquiry should be broadened to embrace an inquiry relative to the activity of our own envoys that have been assigned to foreign governments. Visitors who were, perforce, in Paris in the early days of the war in Europe observed as much excitement, and heard as much talk in the American Embassy as was to be observed in the French foreign office. In Government circles they were more diplomatic about it, but the men on the Paris streets were soon convinced that Washington would join in a declaration of war against Germany that it was found impossible to disabuse their minds. Once more they have progressed to the point of referring to us as Uncle Shylock, interested solely in the ideas of cash on the barrel head; but they still want Uncle Shylock to produce the money and materials that Bullitt is said to have talked about. In today's edition of the New York Times, Anne O'Hare McCormick, writing from London, says American visitors to England "are immediately struck by the growing irritation toward America, partly a reflex of American irritation toward the British, but mostly arising from the disappointment after widespread expectation that the United States was sure to enter the war."

FEARS INVOLVEMENT

Senator REYNOLDS found this widespread expectation, that this country would be "sure" to enter the war, and he very greatly fears, surveying events since his sojourn in Europe, that this country is, in point of fact, being drawn gradually but inexorably toward the western front, or toward the Rhine, which some of our officials are understood to regard as the American frontier.

Once the Hull reciprocal trade agreements extension resolution is disposed of, Senator REYNOLDS expects to introduce his resolution to investigate at once the documentary evidence presented in the German White Book, which purports to link the American envoys in Paris and London to the events leading up to the war in Europe. All the way through President Roosevelt was connected with these disclosures by inference, and in any event there is a feeling here that Secretary Hull has on his hands some more Cromwell cases, which presumably call for more reprimands.

Since Sumner Wells, the Undersecretary of State, has just returned from Berlin, where he talked with Hitler and foreign office officials, Senator REYNOLDS thinks it would be in order to send another man back there on a "fact-finding mission," or that the German Government should be asked for proof of the White Book contents.

WOULD WIDEN DOCTRINE

Having made the investigation he will request, Senator REYNOLDS thinks it would be wise to go further and by formal resolution declare it to be the sense of the Senate that the Monroe Doctrine should be given world-wide application. If this doctrine is to be maintained for the Western Hemisphere, then Senator REYNOLDS feels that the converse of this policy should be recognized, and that we should once more heed the admonition of George Washington to avoid foreign entanglements. Under such a policy other nations would be granted the right to maintain Monroe Doctrines and spheres of influence, all this being no concern of this Nation, whatever American envoys to foreign governments may think about it.

Senator REYNOLDS said today that he had noted that the Chamberlain government is now asking the help of nations at least nominally neutral not to aid in making the world safe for democracy, but in an effort to establish a New World order, which appears to be a grandiose commercial or business affair. H. G. Wells, the English historian, says it contemplates nothing more than an attempt to keep intact the British and French Empires. But whatever the merits of the scheme, whether Wells and his liberal associates, or the British Foreign Office, are right, Senator REYNOLDS thinks this country should remain aloof from all this Old World scheming, and from their never-ending conflict over territory, raw materials, and the spoils of war generally.

The difficulties certain to attend the effort of the common people of this country to keep out of the European conflict are perhaps given additional emphasis by the disclosures of the German White Book, disclosures which may influence the entire world situation despite diplomatic denials. And then there is the circumstance that the entire American economy is rapidly being geared to the European war. A Franco-British coordinating committee is promising to spend a billion dollars for American-made bombers, dollar exchange which might otherwise have been used, in part, in the purchase of American-grown tobacco and fruits.

FISH WANTS PROBE—MIGHT ASK BULLITT IMPEACHMENT

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Representative FISH, Republican, New York, said tonight that he would demand a complete investigation of the German White Book and would seek impeachment of Ambassador William C. Bullitt "if the facts warrant."

In a radio address FISH said that President Roosevelt and Bullitt owed the American people "a categorical and detailed answer" to every charge made in the book.

It was no answer, he said, "to raise the hue and cry of 'propaganda' or to sprinkle a few grains of salt on its tail."

Asked about the charges at his press conference, President Roosevelt suggested that all propaganda from Europe be taken with several grains of salt. Bullitt, the Ambassador to France, also used the salt phrase in denying conversations attributed to him.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask that that be followed by an admirable editorial which I observed yesterday in the columns of the Washington (D. C.) Post, entitled "The Element of Truth."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Washington Post]
THE ELEMENT OF TRUTH

It would be pleasant to feel that the issue of the Polish diplomatic documents, made public in Berlin, has been disposed of by Mr. Hull's statement that he pays not "the slightest credence" to the statements attributed to American diplomats therein.

Unfortunately, memory recalls that only a week ago Mr. Hull found it necessary to rebuke our Minister to Canada for a speech which contravened standing instructions to American diplomatic officers. And there will be many who may be disposed to conclude that where one political ambassador is indiscreet, others have been the same.

It will be noticed that the German disclosures concentrate on statements attributed to two noncareer diplomats, Ambassador Bullitt denies their accuracy, and Ambassador Kennedy, who seems less implicated, may be expected to do likewise. But the sad part of the affair is that the excerpts so far published sound plausible.

And they sound plausible because Mr. Bullitt and Mr. Kennedy, as personal appointees of the President, are known to be in a different category from that of our responsible career diplomats. Considering all the circumstances of their appointments, it would be extraordinary if they did not to some extent regard themselves as personal envoys of Mr. Roosevelt, owing allegiance to him, rather than to the scrupulous regulations and carefully disciplined professional practice of the Department of State.

That is why there is something unsatisfactory in Secretary Hull's insistence that "the statements alleged have not represented in any way, at any time, the thought or the policy of the American Government."

Undoubtedly that is the literal truth. But the whole truth must include suspicion that the alleged statements might well have represented the personal thought and policy of the President, as distinct from that of the administration. And this, it will be noticed, is all that the documents claim.

The German Government has accomplished a very subtle piece of propaganda by the publication of these documents. And, false or true, their effect is not to be minimized. The object, on the one hand, is clearly to make the British and French people believe that the United States egged them into war even though this country had no intention of risking anything in the struggle. And, on the other hand, the Nazis seek to persuade Americans, shortly prior to the Presidential election, that the administration was willing to take sides in the German-Polish quarrel in a way scarcely consistent with complete neutrality.

There is just enough truth in both of these clever insinuations to make them difficult to laugh off. And the propaganda which is built on an element of truth is the really dangerous propaganda. So it would be idle to pretend that Dr. Goebbels has failed to score.

As the subtlety of this propaganda is realized, its damage will be repaired. But from this incident, as from that of the Cromwell speech, a permanent moral stands clear. The sooner all our diplomatic posts are filled from the career service, the sooner there is a final end to the custom of sending personal envoys of the President to represent this country in foreign capitals, the better for the welfare of the United States.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in concluding let me say that we all know that Mr. Sumner Welles, who was dispatched to Europe by the State Department, assumedly at the request of the administration itself, for the purpose of ascertaining the status of matters over there, has but recently returned. The American people were greatly interested in knowing why such a mission was sent. We were told by some officials, and some representatives of the press stated, that he went there for the purpose of endeavoring to bring about peace, which the whole world desires, but later it was revealed that his mission, unfortunately, was not for that purpose. Then it was said that he went there for the purpose of suggesting to the warring nations of the world a disarmament program after the war had ended, and I then and many others were sorry that he had not gone there for the purpose of making a suggestion that the warring nations of the world disarm now before the slaughter began.

Mr. Welles has returned. The American people are extremely desirous of ascertaining from Mr. Welles personally information as to where he went, with whom he talked, when he talked, what he said, and what was said to him. This is no time for secret diplomacy. If we must have a house in Europe I insist that we have a glass house in order that all may see and in order that all may know what is in it.

I say that the seriousness of the situation calls for Mr. Welles, through the State Department, or orally before the Foreign Relations Committee, to make a statement in full and candidly to the American people as to what he found the situation to be, insofar as the American interests are concerned, because the American people, particularly the mothers, now are more concerned as to whether or not their sons will be sent to bleed and die upon the fields of Europe to save the British Empire than they are interested in anything else.

Everywhere I have been in this country for the past several months from time to time the American mothers are saying that they hear the British are sending a million young Frenchmen to their death to save the British Empire, and the American mothers now want to know, and demand to know, whether or not the United States is to send its sons abroad to create a new order in world affairs, because that is now the "come on" cry.

During the World War it was said we were to go over there for the purpose of saving democracy, saving Christianity, and ending all war for all time, but the American people, fortunately, have gotten wise to that, and the new "come on" cry is "Join us, for there must be a new world order."

Mr. President, I say that the American people will not be satisfied until they ascertain the truth or the falsity of the statements which are being made by the Berlin Government; and, therefore, while Mr. Bullitt is in this country I think we should have the opportunity of directing inquiries to

him under oath before the Foreign Relations Committee, or some other committee, as to whether or not these statements are true or false, in order that the American people—who after all pay the taxes—and the American mothers—who after all give of their blood—should know.

In that connection Mr. Welles, as I stated, should tell us with whom he talked, and what they had to say. We want no secret diplomacy now.

At this juncture and in conclusion, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram which I received from a gentleman who lives in Glen Burnie, Md., which reads as follows:

GLEN BURNIE, MD., March 31, 1940.

Senator R. REYNOLDS,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

My family and I are in complete accord with your attitude that all facts in connection with Sumner Welles' European visit be made publicly known at once, keeping in mind it is a Government for the people, of the people, by the people. I ask if it is for the good of the people the secrecy surrounding the past and present activities of the administration in connection with foreign affairs. Above all we must not become involved in war.

W. E. OSTERTAG.

In view of the fact that he says he has a family, I am ready to assume that his good wife was more thoroughly interested in that matter than many others who have no sons who will be called upon to give their blood in the future.

In connection with my resolution I ask that there be printed in the RECORD part of page 402, all of page 403, and part of page 404, a portion of the address of President Monroe made on December 12, 1823, and there is one paragraph which I should like to be provided the opportunity of reading now, and then I shall have concluded:

Our policy in regard to Europe—

I said that I read this in connection with my resolution—which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting, in all instances, the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

Mr. President, I ask that the portions of President Monroe's message of December 2, 1823, to which I referred, being on page 402 to 404, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpt from President Monroe's message is as follows:

It was stated at the commencement of the last session that a great effort was then making in Spain and Portugal to improve the condition of the people of those countries and that it appeared to be conducted with extraordinary moderation. It need scarcely be remarked that the result has been so far very different from what was then anticipated. Of events in that quarter of the globe with which we have so much intercourse and from which we derive our origin we have always been anxious and interested spectators. The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are, of necessity, more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective governments. And to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole Nation is devoted. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny,

by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States. In the war between these new governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.

The late events in Spain and Portugal show that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the allied powers should have thought it proper, on any principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed by force in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote, and surely none more so than the United States. Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government *de facto* as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to these continents, circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course. (Pars. 48 and 49, message of December 2, 1823.)

President Monroe's annual message, December 2, 1823, American State Papers, Foreign Relations, volumes 246, 250.

See President Monroe to Jefferson, December 1823, Fifteenth Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society, January 1902, 411-412; Eighth American Historical Review (October 1902), 50. In this letter President Monroe said: "There is some danger that the British Government, when it sees the part we have taken, may endeavor to throw the whole burden on us and profit, in case of such interposition of the allied powers of her neutrality, at our expense. But I think this would be impossible after what has passed on the subject; besides, it does not follow from what has been said that we should be bound to engage in the war in such event. Of this intimations may be given, should it be necessary. A messenger will depart for England with despatches for Mr. Rush in a few days, who will go on to St. Petersburg with others to Mr. Middleton. And, considering the crisis, it has occurred that a special mission, of the first consideration from the country, directed to England in the first instance, with power to attend any congress that may be convened on the affairs of South America or Mexico might have the happiest effect. You shall hear from me further on this subject."

"The logical conclusion seems to be that the conception of the Monroe Doctrine and much of its phraseology came from Adams and that the share of Monroe did not extend beyond revision." (Redaway, the Monroe Doctrine, 87.)

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for the purpose of incorporating certain matters in the Record at this point?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BYRNES. In connection with the statement as to the White Book revelations by the Hitler government, and the truth or untruth of these revelations, it is pertinent to know the views of Hitler as to propaganda. I ask to read a short paragraph from Mr. Hitler's book *Mein Kampf*. Mr. Hitler in his book, in stating what should be the attitude of the Government in discussing war guilt, said:

It was fundamentally wrong, when discussing the subject of war guilt, to suggest that Germany could be counted as partly responsible for the outbreak of that catastrophe; the proper thing would have been to lay the burden of it without cease upon the enemy, even if this did not correspond with the true course of events, as was nevertheless the actual fact. The masses are in no position to distinguish where foreign illegality begins and our own ends.

I also ask to have included as part of my remarks the statements of Hitler on the subject of war propaganda, which appear in the unexpurgated edition of his book *Mein Kampf*.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

What was least understood was the first prerequisite of any propaganda activity whatever—a deliberately subjective, one-sided attitude toward every question discussed. The sins in this direction at the very beginning of the war and from the top down were such that one was really justified in doubting whether such madness could really all be ascribed to pure stupidity.

What, for instance, would people say to a poster which was meant to advertise a new soap, but which also described other soaps as "good"? They would simply shake their heads.

But the same thing is true of political advertising. It is the task of propaganda not, for instance, to assay the various causes but to emphasize exclusively the one cause it represents. It must not objectively explore any truth that favors the other side, and then present it to the masses with doctrinaire honesty, but must perpetually labor for its own truths.

It was a fundamental error to discuss guilt from the standpoint that Germany could not be made solely responsible for the outbreak of the catastrophe; the right way was to load the guilt solely upon the enemy, even if this had not corresponded to the actual situation, which in this case it really did.

But all the brilliance of presentation in the world will not lead to the success of propaganda unless one fundamental principle is always kept clearly in view. Propaganda must limit itself to saying a very little, and this little it must keep forever repeating. Perseverance, here as so often in this world, is the first and most important prerequisite for success.

In the field of propaganda we must never be guided by aesthetics or the *blasé*—not by the former because the expression and form of what was said would soon have drawing power only for literary tea parties instead of being suited to the masses; the latter we must anxiously shun because their own lack of emotional freshness is constantly seeking new stimulants. These people are soon fed up with anything; they want variety, and they cannot put themselves in the place of their less surfeited fellow men, or even understand their needs. They are always the first to criticize propaganda, or rather its substance, which seems to them too old-fashioned, too stale, and then again too outworn. They are always looking for something new, seeking variety, and thus are the death of any effective political mass recruiting. For as soon as organization and substance of any propaganda begin to be made for these people's needs, they lose any sort of unity, and instead are altogether dissipated.

The purpose of propaganda is not to be a constant source of interesting diversion for *blasé* little gentlemen, but to convince, and to convince the masses. But they are so slow moving that it is always some time before they are ready even to take notice of a thing, and only thousandfold repetition of the simplest ideas will finally stick in their minds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement of the reasons why I voted for the Pittman amendment and intend to vote against the joint resolution extending the power of the President to make reciprocal-trade agreements.

The act of June 12, 1934, which it is proposed to extend, delegates to the President power to make foreign trade agreements increasing or decreasing the existing tariff rates by 50 percent "whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States."

This delegation is so broad that it affords no standard whatever for the new tariff rates which are to be fixed by the President. If the President happens to approve the theory of protection, the rates will be protective of American industry and agriculture. If the President happens to be a free-trader, the rates may be made for revenue only and may admit foreign products in competition with manufactured products, with agricultural products, and with the products of our mines and oil wells.

Whether or not the delegation of authority is so general that the Supreme Court will hold it to be unconstitutional may be open to question. However, it seems to me clear that a Congress bound by the Constitution should not delegate to the Executive the determination of the whole policy underlying our tariff. This is no theoretical objection. The act, as passed and as proposed to be extended, would permit a free-trade Secretary of State to destroy an American industry. The Canadian agreement reducing the tariff on lumber, the Venezuelan agreement reducing the tariff on oil, the Cuban agreement reducing the tariff on sugar, the Canadian and Mexican agreements reducing the tariff on livestock, and many others, have permitted foreign goods competing with some of our major products to be delivered in this country, pay the tariff, and still undersell the same article produced in the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Surely.

Mr. BROWN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that we have an agreement with Mexico?

Mr. TAFT. I think we have an agreement which at least applies to Mexico, permitting the introduction of Mexican livestock at a rate lower than the regular tariff duty.

Mr. BROWN. I have listened very carefully to the various hearings of the Finance Committee, and I am fairly certain there is no trade agreement with Mexico.

Mr. TAFT. It may be that the Canadian treaty, through the most-favored-nation clause, extends that privilege to Mexico. I only know that when I was in Texas I met persons who said they were actually buying Mexican cattle and taking advantage of a treaty. I have not verified the fact.

Mr. BROWN. I am certain there is no agreement with Mexico.

Mr. TAFT. Except for quotas, there would be little left of some American industries. Obviously, to the extent that the quota does not limit importation, American production is decreased, and unemployment increased.

Since there does not seem to be the slightest intention on the part of the administration to impose any standard of protection in the joint resolution, I see no choice for anyone who believes in the protection of American industry, mining, and agriculture except to vote against the measure. Since the administration refused to permit Congress to impose a standard in advance of the making of treaties, I voted for the Pittman amendment to reserve the right to approve the treaties after they are made. I listened with interest to the debate on the question whether or not the foreign trade agreements provided for by the act are treaties and therefore must be subject to Senate ratification. Without passing on that question, I voted for the Pittman amendment, because apparently it was the only possible amendment having any chance of adoption which would limit the discretion now given to the President and the Secretary of State.

I cast this vote with some reluctance, because I believe Congress should delegate to an executive body, like the Tariff Commission, power to fix the actual rates on different products after Congress itself has determined the main question as to whether the United States shall adopt the policy of free trade, or the policy of protection. The actual making of tariffs by Congress has been an unsatisfactory process, and in my opinion has produced some tariffs considerably higher than were actually necessary for protection. Congress, as a body, is almost as awkward when it comes to fixing tariff rates, as in the case of railroad rates. I believe the power to fix rates may be delegated, and that some constitutional method may be worked out by which rate reductions will be dependent on rate reductions being made by foreign countries on American exports. I hope that if the joint resolution shall fall, such a plan will be developed within the limits of the Constitution.

In accord with that idea, I am proposing an amendment to the joint resolution providing that no foreign trade agreement shall go into effect until the Tariff Commission shall have filed a statement certifying that it will not reduce the rate of duty on any article below an amount sufficient to equalize the difference between the cost of such articles in this country and abroad. The amendment further provides that after the agreement is made it shall be published, and the Tariff Commission shall hold public hearings on the specific rates proposed before making any certification. The purpose of the amendment is to provide a definite standard which the executive department must follow.

In my opinion, any delegation of authority must contain a definite statement of the protective principle. This country for years has adopted a policy of protection. It has built up a higher wage scale than exists anywhere else in the world. It has built up a higher standard of living. It is possible that, in theory, free trade would produce a higher average level of prosperity over the entire world; but certainly for the time being it would tend to level down the country with the highest standard of living. This is particularly true today, when the rest of the world is impoverished by war, a condition likely to continue for many years, even after the war shall end. It is particularly true today, when foreign currencies are constantly depreciating.

Conditions have also changed since the days when the free-trade theory was approved by many economists. According to that theory, our special ability in mass production would maintain our standard of living without a tariff. But today,

when American machinery can be transferred to countries where wages are only one-third of the wages in this country, any advantage we have from quantity production very quickly evaporates.

Many Senators and others are in favor of free trade in theory, but whenever they run up against an actual case of foreign competition with the products of their own State they immediately demand protection. It at once becomes clear to them that regardless of theory, the wages paid in this country and the other costs are so much higher than foreign wages and costs in many industries that the American product simply cannot successfully compete under free trade. Free trade is a theory which no party in America today can long carry out in practice. Our effort must be to hold down the tariff to the minimum which will afford adequate protection, but will not create an embargo on foreign imports.

I have heard much loose argument to the effect that the tariff is merely a subsidy for wealthy manufacturers. Of course, this is untrue. It protects the products of our mines, our forests, and our farms. It protects the American wage level and the American standard of living. The American livestock industry, for instance, would be almost destroyed if Argentine meat were freely admitted to this country. Of course, the tariff tends to raise the price of American products, but the greater part of that increase is absorbed in increased wages and other costs. If the Department of Justice does its job in enforcing competition—and I think it is doing that job today—there will be just as much competition behind the tariff wall as there would be if no tariff existed; and that competition will keep prices as low as they can be kept consistent with American costs of production and American wages. It is true that the prices of a limited number of farm products cannot benefit from a tariff because they depend on a surplus production to be sold on world markets, where they must take the world price. For the limited number of products of this class, export subsidies or other devices should serve the purpose of a tariff if properly worked out.

In my opinion, therefore, Congress must declare the policy of the United States to be one of protecting American producers. The amendment which I have offered is intended to lay down a reasonable standard of protection, which I believe should be adopted if any further extension of the reciprocal trade treaty policy is to be granted.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCarran], which is similar to a resolution I introduced a year ago on the same subject. It is not my intention to detain the Senate with a long speech on this subject, as I stated my position and the reasons therefor in the Senate last week.

I believe that when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was first considered in Congress it was the understanding and intention that import excise taxes should not be disturbed. I think Congress intended—certainly Congress should have intended—to keep in its own hands control of the excise taxes.

I am making a plea to my colleagues today to support the McCarran amendment in the interest of the independent oil producers of Kansas and other Western States and in the interest of the consumers of the Nation. The consumers' protection against monopoly in the petroleum industry is the independent producer. His ability to stay in business is seriously jeopardized by imports of petroleum from Venezuela. Congress finally realized the necessity of protection for the petroleum industry in 1932 by providing an excise tax on imports.

Whatever may have been the intention of Congress, last December a trade agreement was negotiated with Venezuela by which the protection afforded the independent producers was cut in half.

This reduction threatens the stability of the petroleum industry in the midcontinent and west-coast fields. It is a very serious threat to independent producers in those fields. The reduction does not help Venezuela or Venezuelans, but it does improve the opportunities for three large American oil companies operating from Venezuela to work toward monop-

listic control of the Atlantic seaboard territory, squeeze the independents out of this trade territory, and then apply the squeeze over the rest of the Nation.

I desire to read to the Senate the following statements in a letter to me from Russell B. Brown, representing the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Since the inclusion of the petroleum excise taxes in trade agreements is being discussed in the Senate, I feel you are entitled to know the position of the domestic petroleum industry.

Mr. Brown writes me.

Congress adopted these taxes by a nonpartisan vote, based on economic and not political conditions. The independent oil men do not wish to be drawn into any political dispute, but the impending consequences of greatly increased imports resulting from the reduction in these excise taxes through the Venezuelan trade agreement are so serious that they feel compelled to present their situation to you. They are doing this because Congress is the only place left for such a presentation. They have previously tried to present their case to the State Department. They have appealed to the President. Their problem has nowhere received the consideration necessary to correct the injury they have suffered through the Venezuelan trade agreement.

Since the original adoption of the excise taxes Congress has exercised a biennial supervision over them to observe their effect in protecting the domestic petroleum industry from demoralization, in preventing the occurrence of an oil monopoly, in maintaining and promoting exploratory work and development work which adds to the Nation's oil reserves, in encouraging competition, and in protecting the interests of the consumer. This biennial supervision appears to be destroyed through the inclusion of these taxes in a trade agreement.

Again I express the hope, Mr. President, that the McCarran amendment will be adopted and that the power to deal with the excise taxes on imports of petroleum, coal, copper, and lumber will be retained in the hands of Congress.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in the books may be found many definitions of reciprocity. In the 150 years of our national life there have been many efforts to give effect to reciprocity. The fisheries, shipping, trade arrangements, and practices, and, in particular, customs duties, have come within the scope of the principle as it has from time to time been understood and sought to be applied. One could quote almost interminably the writings and the utterances of our public men and of students not in public life upon this subject. I can see, however, no present advantage in so doing. I think I am justified in broadly asserting that Republicans have generally been the advocates of reciprocal proposals and that Democrats have opposed the particular efforts made in behalf thereof. It is important, however, to make it clear that no responsible Republican ever heretofore advocated reciprocity as now conceived and as now the subject of discussion, and that no Democrat before this hour ever defended such surrender of congressional control of the taxing power, such effort by the Senate to yield its rights and evade and avoid its constitutional obligations as an essential party to treaty making, or such a concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the Executive as inhere in the pending legislation.

Mr. President, I desire to place before the Senate and to make known to the people of the State of Maine the foremost reasons which compel me to vote against this legislation. So far as possible, I propose to avoid argumentative speech and to limit myself to a statement almost in summary form of the views I hold.

First of all, I conceive this legislation to be an attempt to delegate authority to the President in disregard of constitutional inhibition. Able lawyers in this body in their speeches of recent days have confirmed me in this opinion. That there are agreements not of the dignity of treaties I concede. That these may be entered into without Senate ratification I acknowledge. The President's authority to negotiate and conclude such arrangements is found in the Constitution and in the nature of the Presidential office. Legislation by the Congress is not needed to confer upon him the power to make agreements of this kind with foreign nations, and it is equally certain that legislation cannot confer upon him the power to make agreements which are treaties. Neither the Senate nor the Congress can give to the President the right to do alone that which the Constitution says can only be done by

the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I doubt if these general propositions will be challenged. The question, then, is in what class do these agreements of which we speak properly fall? To my mind, the overwhelming weight of authority and of reason declare them to be treaties. To my mind each and every one heretofore negotiated is violative of the Constitution, and each and every one hereafter negotiated will be evidence of further disregard of our fundamental law and of the rights of the Senate of the United States. Constitutional principles and democratic principles are both flouted in order that practical ends, as they are called, may be speedily attained.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that if these arrangements are not treaties, the President needed no legislative act to authorize their negotiation. He had that power. Why, then, were we asked to pass the 1934 act? There can be but one answer. Clearly it was because the President wanted to negotiate and conclude arrangements with foreign nations which he did not otherwise have the power to consummate. He wanted to make what were in their substance treaties without the necessity of securing Senate advice and consent evidenced by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate. And it is equally certain that the Congress sought to confer the right in order to free him from this Senate check upon his unrestrained discretion and act. This request for authority and this congressional action demonstrate to me at least that the President asked, and that the Congress sought to give to the President alone, a treaty-making power lodged by the Constitution in the President and the Senate.

I still insist the Constitution may not be altered in such a way.

Mr. President, I pass over other phases of the question as to the powers which Congress can delegate. My views coincide closely with those of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. I wish to address myself briefly to the proposition that, even were the 1934 Trade Agreements Act a lawful grant of power, the act itself has been misinterpreted in one important particular by those charged with its administration.

The act in question, for certain general purposes, gives to the President "whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified," authority from time to time—

First. To enter into foreign-trade agreements.

Second. To proclaim modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, and so forth, as are required or are appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement which the President has entered into hereunder.

The act further provides that no proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists.

Now, Mr. President, I assert as incontrovertible that the President may negotiate a trade agreement under this act only when two situations exist. He may act only if and when he has found that an existing duty or other existing import restriction unduly burdens and restricts the foreign trade of the United States, and if and when he has found that his action will promote the general purposes declared by section 350 (a).

This language, and the whole spirit of the act, make clear that Presidential intervention is justified only if existing duties or other import restrictions are burdening our foreign trade. The provision of the act prohibiting the transfer of any article from the free list to the dutiable list but further emphasizes the stubborn fact that the theory underlying this legislation was and is that existing duties may unduly burden our commerce, and that when they do they may be lessened in their weight by the permitted reduction. But when was it ever before asserted by those on the majority side that free entry of an article unduly burdened our foreign trade?

When was it ever before urged that an existing duty or import restriction burdened the foreign trade of this country when in fact there was no duty at all and no restriction at all upon the commodity dealt with? If it be now asserted that the free entry of an article does constitute a restriction burdening our foreign trade, what can be the justification for permitting the President to bind that free entry for a term of years, thus perpetuating the alleged restriction and burden?

The act proposed to be extended gives the President jurisdiction over an article only when a duty or a restriction upon its movement burdens the trade of this country. There is no such duty and there is no such restriction when the article enters this country free of duty. There can, therefore, be no Presidential jurisdiction over it. The basic conception of this legislation is that a duty may be burdensome and restrictive, and that in such case and upon such a finding the President may afford relief through a negotiated treaty. To find that free entry constitutes such a burden as to give the President jurisdiction, and then to bind this article so burdening our trade upon the free list, is a contradiction and an absurdity.

Mr. President, it was never believed that the presence of an article on the free list, with no quota or other limitation upon its unrestricted flow, would be held to be a restrictive burden upon our foreign trade. Other charges have been leveled at the presence of a particular commodity upon the free list, but this contention is new to our political thought.

I contend that the President cannot, with proper regard for the act and for fact, assume jurisdiction over the free list and bind thereon hundreds of articles and things. The Canadian treaty alone has bound upon the free list some 22 or 23 commodities now imported into this country in intensified competition with the products of my own State. I assert this to be wholly unwarranted by the legislation before us.

Considerations other than those of a legal nature impel me to oppose this legislation. I am against placing in the control of a single man such power as the act gives to affect for good or ill the economic, the agricultural, the industrial, and the social life of our people.

This legislation as it is interpreted gives to the President power to favor one section of our country to the prejudice of another; to build one industry upon the ruins of another; to profit one class of workers at the loss of another class; to sacrifice industry to agriculture, or to advance the cause of industry at the cost of agriculture. I am against the lodging of such powers in any one man.

I oppose this legislation further because I believe it to be part of a general assault upon the protective system, an assault which has already done harm to agriculture and particular branches of industry, and which, if persisted in and pressed to the point to which its advocates would extend it, must do untold injury to American agriculture and industry and must level down American standards of wage and life to those of other nations. I have seen life in too many countries of the world to welcome such results for America. Already over a thousand tariff rates have been lowered. Unless this tendency is checked, we shall soon be upon the lowest tariff basis in at least a half century. I am not ready to contribute to this disaster.

In particular, I shall vote against this joint resolution because of the impact of the treaties negotiated thereunder upon the State of Maine, its interests, and its people. In greater degree than any other State, Maine is surrounded by Canada. Almost every product of the farm, the forests, and the waters of my State is likewise produced by the farm, the forests, and the waters of Canada. Hardly a concession could be made to the products of eastern Canada except at the cost of a product of Maine. By the Canadian treaty the duties were reduced upon butter and eggs, cheese, milk, cream, apples, potatoes, livestock and hay, upon lumber and timber, upon pulp and pulpwood, upon fish found in our coastal waters and the products thereof, and upon many other articles and things produced in Maine, or these products were frozen upon the free list beyond the reach of remedial efforts. I venture the assertion that a larger percentage of the products of my State

has been adversely affected by the exercise of this tariff-making power than in the case of any other State. The knowledge that they have been offered up as a vicarious sacrifice to the interests of some other part of the United States, that some other industry elsewhere may be benefited by their new hardships, neither clothes nor feeds nor houses the people of Maine.

I should do violence to my convictions that this legislation is unconstitutional; that it confers dangerous powers upon a single man; that it threatens the well-being of our country; and particularly that it prejudices the interests and people of my own State, and that the exercise of the powers claimed to be conferred is more liable to lead to international discord than to international understanding and peace, if I did not by my voice and vote register my disapproval of the pending measure.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHITE. I do.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have listened with great admiration to the illuminating address of the Senator from Maine. His allusion to the fixing on the free list of a large number of items which interest the State of Maine and which also interest the State of Vermont moves me to ask him a question which I think is the test of the soundness of the act. To reduce the matter to the most absurd form, assume that there is only one item which is fixed on the free list for the period of 3 years and 6 months, the duration of the agreement; what has been done to the legislative power of Congress during that period of 3 years and 6 months?

Mr. WHITE. Of course, in the case stated by the Senator from Vermont, Congress has been deprived of the power to deal with that article, and if these arrangements have validity and are constitutional, we have entered into a solemn covenant with another nation that we will not touch that article during the life of the agreement.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. When I asked the Senator from Missouri to yield I did not observe the presence of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who has charge of the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. Several Senators will be necessarily absent this afternoon, or within a few moments. It is apparent to everyone that it will be at least 5 o'clock, or nearly that hour, before we can reach a vote on the pending amendment. It would greatly inconvenience at least two Senators for debate to be prolonged that long, with a vote at that time. I therefore ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment or any substitute for it, beginning immediately after the approval of the Journal tomorrow, debate be limited to 10 minutes for any individual Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow debate on the pending amendment or any substitute therefor be limited to 10 minutes for each Senator. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. I think that is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just a minute, please. As I understand, a 10-minute limitation is asked for on this amendment or any other amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; merely on the pending amendment, or any substitute for it.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for no limitation on debate on the joint resolution generally, or on any other amendment, but merely for a 10-minute limitation upon debate by any individual Senator on this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We had better have the author of the amendment present before any agreement on the subject is made. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Downey	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	Ellender	Lucas	Shipstead
Bailey	Frazier	Lundeen	Smathers
Bankhead	George	McCarran	Smith
Barbour	Gerry	McKellar	Stewart
Barkley	Gibson	McNary	Taft
Bilbo	Gillette	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Glass	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Green	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gurney	Minton	Tobey
Bulow	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Norris	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Nye	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Overton	Van Nuys
Chandler	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chavez	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Hughes	Radcliffe	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	
Danaher	King	Russell	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to the roll call, a quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I again make the request, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is in the Chamber now, that after 12 o'clock tomorrow no individual Senator may speak longer than 10 minutes on the pending amendment, or any amendment thereto, or substitute therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I respectfully suggest that we compromise the matter by making the limitation 20 minutes on the amendment or any substitute therefor. I think the Senator from Mississippi will probably be agreeably surprised at the shortness of the debate.

Mr. HARRISON. I think we can get through very quickly. May I suggest a compromise of 15 minutes?

Mr. McCARRAN. I prefer my compromise.

Mr. HARRISON. I agree to the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean by his request that during the further consideration of the pending amendment debate shall be limited to 20 minutes on the amendment and on the joint resolution?

Mr. HARRISON. No; I saw that there would be very violent objection to that.

Mr. McNARY. I stated that I would object to any limitation of debate on the joint resolution—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have stated that I would object to any limitation of debate on the joint resolution or any other amendment save the one under consideration at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. My understanding is that the request is as to the pending amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. That commencing tomorrow at 12 o'clock no Senator may speak longer than 20 minutes on the pending amendment or any substitute therefor. Is that the understanding?

Mr. HARRISON. I had hoped to make the time 15 minutes, but I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi modifies his request. Is there objection to the request as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, before I begin the brief remarks which I wish to make directly to the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I desire to make a few remarks which it had been my hope to make on Friday last before the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] was voted upon.

The contention advanced in the debate on the amendment of the senior Senator from Nevada that under the Constitution of the United States ratification by two-thirds of the Senate of the United States was necessary for the validity of the trade agreements, in other words, argument to the effect that the trade agreements were in fact treaties and as such must necessarily, under the Constitution, be considered as treaties and accordingly submitted to the Senate for ratification, was so completely answered and so devastatingly dealt with by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that I would not presume to retrace in any degree whatever the arguments which were made by the Senator from Georgia in his masterly address. In my opinion, no man who ever sat in this body has had a clearer legal mind and more lucid power of expression on legal and constitutional questions than the Senator from Georgia, and it seems to me that in that respect his argument upon the pending measure was and will remain unanswerable.

Not by way of enlarging upon the argument of the Senator from Georgia, but merely to add another set of records which the Senator from Georgia did not have the opportunity to consider, I desire to call attention to certain facts with regard to the trade agreements provided for in section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, generally known as the Dingley Act.

A great deal of emphasis was placed by the senior Senator from Nevada on his allegation that the agreements concluded under section 3 of the act of 1897 were merely temporary *modi vivendi*, which could be terminated at any time by either party to such an agreement. On the other hand, he stated, the agreements under the present Trade Agreements Act are treaties, since they run for periods of 3 years.

Mr. President, first it is important to note that the Trade Agreements Act is in fact definitely more restrictive with respect to the duration of agreements than was section 3 of the Dingley Act, which made no provision whatever and contained no limitation whatever with respect to the duration of the agreements therein authorized. On the other hand, and in direct contrast, the present Trade Agreements Act, the extension of which is the question now pending before the Senate, limits the maximum original term of any agreement to 3 years, but it does not require or contemplate that these agreements shall necessarily be for terms of 3 years. Moreover, after the maximum initial period of the trade agreements of 3 years, the agreements are terminable under the terms of the act on not more than 6 months' notice. This further limitation was not in the act of 1897. In fact, as is shown by the table which I propose to append to these remarks, a substantial number of the trade agreements made under the present act were made for initial periods of less than the maximum period of 3 years. Several of them, in fact, were originally terminable upon 6 months' notice.

The table also shows that as of today some 15 agreements out of the 20 agreements still in effect are now terminable upon not more than 6 months' notice, since their original terms have now expired.

The appended memorandum summarizing the terms of the 15 agreements concluded under section 3 of the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 shows that at least two of the agreements were for longer terms than those permitted by the present Trade Agreements Act. The agreement with Portugal under the Dingley Act was for a term of 5 years, and thereafter was only terminable after 1 year's notice. The agreement with Italy was for a period of approximately 3½ years, and thereafter was terminable upon not less than 1 year's notice.

In the case of several agreements the term was indefinite, for example, the French agreement, which was signed on May 28, 1898, and which was apparently terminated only by the Tariff Act of 1909, 11 years later. It may be noted

in this connection that there was quite a diplomatic dispute with France with respect to our right to terminate an agreement within an indefinite term. These indefinite agreements were thus much less limited than in the case of the trade agreements entered into under the present law, which are for specified short terms. It may further be noted that many of these agreements were embraced in formal documents, and not consummated by a mere exchange of notes.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I have been somewhat disturbed in regard to the question of termination to which the Senator from Missouri is now addressing himself. Does the Senator think there is any authority left in the Congress itself to terminate a trade agreement, or is that authority entirely in the executive department of the Government?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator I think the agreements could be terminated by act of Congress.

Mr. BROWN. By what method could Congress terminate an agreement? The repeal of the law would not operate to that effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I assume it would require an affirmative act of Congress directing the President to terminate the notice, which would, in my opinion, be within the jurisdiction of Congress. Of course, it would require the signature of the President.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator recognizes that against an unwilling Executive it would mean that a two-thirds vote of the Senate and of the House would be required to bring about termination of the agreement?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is unquestionably true, as it is true in regard to every other law upon the statute books. The same argument was made in regard to the reorganization bill, and the same argument is made and is applicable to every other grant of power to the President of the United States.

Mr. BROWN. Looking at the other side of the controversy, because I am not partisan with respect to this matter at all, it seems to me that we are going quite far when we say to the Executive, "You can tie up this matter for any length of time you desire." The treaties are for 3 years—"agreements" is a better word—the agreements are for 3 years, and for a period thereafter until the President gives 6 months' notice of termination.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the point to which I was addressing myself was a comparison of the powers granted under the Trade Agreements Act and under the act of 1897, in response to what was said in the debate last week by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and I was pointing out that the powers as to duration of time—the powers under the act of 1897 were much more extensive than under this act, and in one case which I cited, the agreement with France, was absolutely indefinite as to time, and was only terminated in fact by the passage of an act by Congress, to with the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act.

Mr. BROWN. The other feature to which I should like the Senator to put his mind is this—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall be glad to put my mind to things which may interest the Senator from Michigan when I shall have concluded the matter concerning which I am trying to address to the Senate. I shall be glad to discuss that question or any other question at that time, but I should like to continue my statement, and then take up what the Senator has in mind a little later.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may place something in the RECORD in answer to the first question asked by the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington for that purpose.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. I recall to the memory of the Senator from Michigan the citation which I placed in the RECORD last Friday, the case of *Van Der Weyde v. Ocean Transport Co., Ltd., et al.* (297 U. S. 114), in which the precise question of the direction by Congress to the President either to abrogate or to modify a treaty was made in section 16 of

the Seamen's Act of March 4, 1915, and in this opinion, which was written by Chief Justice Hughes, the Supreme Court said:

As to the third point, we think that the question as to the authority of the Executive in the absence of congressional action, or of action by the treaty-making power, to denounce a treaty of the United States is not here involved. In this instance the Congress requested and directed the President to give notice of the termination of the treaty provisions in conflict with the act. From every point of view, it was incumbent upon the President, charged with the conduct of negotiations with foreign governments and also with the duty to take care that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed, to reach a conclusion as to the inconsistency between the provisions of the treaty and the provisions of the new law.

In other words, the Supreme Court very definitely said that when the Congress authorized and directed the President to take a certain action in reference to treaties which were in effect there was a responsibility upon the President, since he did have imposed on him the duty to take care that the laws of the United States are faithfully executed, to carry out that direction of the Congress, and to reserve, modify, or to abrogate a treaty as Congress directed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in regard to the other question of the Senator from Michigan, I hope the Senator from Michigan did not think I had the slightest intention of being discourteous when I suggested that I should like to continue with my remarks.

Mr. BROWN. Not at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator from Michigan, of course, that so far as changing this situation by an act of Congress is concerned, it would necessarily, in case of veto by the President, take a two-thirds vote of each branch of the Congress to effectuate such a change. That would be equally true, however, if the agreements were considered as treaties and ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. That situation would not in the slightest degree be affected by the question of whether these instruments are agreements or treaties.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, it has been generally conceded here that Congress may by an act abrogate a treaty which has been ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Inasmuch as these agreements do not rise to the dignity of a treaty, of course, we should be bound to concede that the same sort of action would affect one of these agreements that would affect a treaty which had been ratified by two-thirds vote.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. That is one point that deeply concerns me. Does the Senator from Missouri agree with the Senator from Kentucky that by a concurrent resolution the Senate and the House could abrogate a trade agreement?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not understand the Senator from Kentucky to say that. He said an act of Congress, which could not be a concurrent resolution. It would require either a joint resolution or a bill, which would have to be signed by the President.

Mr. BROWN. That comes back to the point that against an unwilling Executive, an Executive who had vetoed the bill or joint resolution, it would take a two-thirds vote of the House and Senate to abrogate the measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And that would be true as to any law that Congress desired to repeal, if the President vetoed it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is true with regard to the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Act or any other law. Under the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Act, Congress granted the President authority to raise or lower rates 50 percent. As against an unwilling Executive, that could be changed only by an act of Congress by a two-thirds vote of each body. So, it seems to me, the situation would be precisely the same.

Mr. BROWN. No; I think there is a difference. In the case of the Smoot-Hawley Act or any other legislation, we enact the legislation. We determine what the rates are. In this case, we pass on to the President the right to enter into trade agreements. We do not know what they are going

to be; we do not know what their contents will be; we do not know what the rates will be. If we are entirely dissatisfied with the rates, as we may be, we put ourselves in such a position that it would take two-thirds of the Senate and the House to abrogate the agreement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, Congress passed an act giving the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to fix railroad rates. If the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes some railroad rates that Congress does not like, what can Congress do about it? Congress cannot do anything except to pass an act either exercising its legislative functions of changing those rates or ending the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates; and if the President of the United States does not like that act of Congress, and sees fit to veto it, the same situation exists; that is, it takes two-thirds of each House to override the veto.

Mr. BROWN. The cases are not parallel at all. In the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission, we grant it certain authority to fix rates. It is not a body that has the power to veto an act of Congress. The President of the United States has that right. But in the case of the trade agreements we are granting authority to the President, who happens to be the governmental official who has the power of veto, which does not exist in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is a distinction of fact without any distinction of law, if I may be pardoned for saying so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. A while ago the Senator from Michigan stated that in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act the rates were fixed, or that in a resolution we might pass we could fix the rates, whereas in this particular resolution the rates are not fixed. I think they must be considered as having been already fixed by law. They are in the Smoot-Hawley Act.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Just as much so as in the case of the provisions of the flexible-tariff measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; just as we set out in the act of 1934 what the rates would be, but authorized the President to modify them 50 percent up or down by trade agreements. Under the Hawley-Smoot Act and previous acts the President, on the advice and recommendation of the Tariff Commission, could raise or lower the rates within the limitation of 50 percent. So I think, for all intents and purposes, we may consider that the present law is based on the acknowledged fact that the rates have already been fixed by Congress, and they are just as effective as if they were carried in this law, and the President is authorized to change them by 50 percent, up or down, and no more. So we really do not get away from the situation fixed in the act in which the Tariff Commission was established and in which the President was authorized to fix the rates.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks a table showing the trade agreements in force as of March 1, 1940, the country with which the agreement has been made, the date signed, the date effective, the initial term of duration, and the date at which the agreement may be terminated by 6 months' notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Trade agreements in force Mar. 1, 1940

Country	Date signed	Date effective	Initial term of duration ¹	Agreement may be terminated after the following date on 6 months' prior notice ¹
Belgium.....	Feb. 27, 1935	May 1, 1935	Until 6 months after notice of termination.	
Brazil.....	Feb. 2, 1935	Jan. 1, 1936	2 years.....	Dec. 31, 1937

¹ All of these agreements (except that with Haiti) are subject to modification or termination on short notice under special contingencies stipulated therein, i. e., the "escape clauses."

Trade agreements in force Mar. 1, 1940—Continued

Country	Date signed	Date effective	Initial term of duration	Agreement may be terminated after the following date on 6 months' prior notice
Canada.....	Nov. 17, 1938	Jan. 1, 1939	Approximately 3 years.	Nov. 25, 1941
Colombia.....	Sept. 13, 1935	May 20, 1936	2 years.....	May 19, 1938
Costa Rica.....	Nov. 28, 1936	Aug. 2, 1937	3 years.....	Aug. 1, 1940
Cuba.....	Aug. 24, 1934	Sept. 3, 1934	do.....	Sept. 2, 1937
Ecuador.....	Aug. 6, 1938	Oct. 23, 1938	Until 6 months after notice of termination.	
Finland.....	May 18, 1936	Nov. 2, 1936	3 years.....	Nov. 1, 1939
France.....	May 6, 1936	June 15, 1936	Until July 1, 1937.....	June 30, 1937
Guatemala.....	Apr. 24, 1936	do.....	3 years.....	June 14, 1939
Haiti.....	Mar. 28, 1935	June 3, 1935	do.....	June 2, 1938
Honduras.....	Dec. 18, 1935	Mar. 2, 1936	1 year.....	Mar. 1, 1937
Netherlands.....	Dec. 20, 1935	Feb. 1, 1936	Until Jan. 1, 1939.....	Dec. 31, 1938
Nicaragua ²	Mar. 11, 1936	Oct. 1, 1936	3 years.....	Sept. 30, 1939
Salvador.....	Feb. 19, 1937	May 31, 1937	do.....	May 30, 1940
Sweden.....	May 25, 1935	Aug. 5, 1935	do.....	Aug. 4, 1938
Switzerland.....	Jan. 9, 1936	Feb. 15, 1936	Until Feb. 14, 1939.....	Feb. 13, 1939
United Kingdom.....	Nov. 17, 1938	Jan. 1, 1939	Until Dec. 31, 1941.....	Dec. 30, 1941
Turkey.....	Apr. 1, 1939	May 5, 1939	1 to 3 years ³	Dec. 31, 1941
Venezuela.....	Nov. 6, 1939	Dec. 16, 1939	(4).....	Dec. 15, 1942

² The duty concessions in this agreement were terminated by mutual consent effective Mar. 10, 1938.

³ The Government of either country may terminate this agreement at the end of 1939, 1940, or 1941 on 2 months' written notice, but if it is not so terminated it shall continue in force indefinitely subject to 6 months' prior notice.

⁴ The agreement will come definitively into force after ratification by Venezuela for an initial term ending Dec. 15, 1942. Pending ratification, the substantive provisions of the agreement were made provisionally effective for a year from Dec. 16, 1939.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, a table giving the summary of the 15 executive agreements concluded under section 3 of the Dingley Tariff Act of 1897, in connection with which I direct particular attention to the agreements with Portugal, Italy, and France, as I mentioned a moment ago; also, a summary of the 12 executive agreements entered into under section 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890, which conveyed similar powers and in which the result of the statute was similar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

FIFTEEN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER SECTION 3 OF THE DINGLEY TARIFF ACT OF 1897 (30 STAT. 151, 203)

I. NOTE

The texts of all but two of these agreements appear in Malloy, *Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols, and Agreements Between the United States and Other Powers* at the pages cited hereafter. The references to the texts of the other two agreements are given in the list of agreements which appears under part III. Except where noted under part III, the agreements were in the form of a formal international document reciting the authority of the signatories and, in most cases, the purposes of the agreement, as well as the particular concessions granted. In each case, of course, the concessions granted by the United States were limited to those authorized by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897. Consequently, in the summary of the agreements contained in part III, the concessions granted by the United States have, in most cases, not been specified.

II. SUMMARY OF SECTION 3 OF THE DINGLEY TARIFF ACT OF 1897

"That for the purpose of equalizing the trade of the United States with foreign countries, and their colonies, producing and exporting to this country the following articles: Argols, or crude tartar, or wine lees, crude; brandies, or other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials; champagne and all other sparkling wines; still wines, and vermouth; paintings and statuary; or any of them, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, as soon as may be after the passage of this act and from time to time thereafter, to enter into negotiations with the governments of those countries exporting to the United States the above-mentioned articles, or any of them, with a view to the arrangement of commercial agreements in which reciprocal and equivalent concessions may be secured in favor of the products and manufacturers of the United States; and whenever the government of any country, or colony, producing and exporting to the United States the above-mentioned articles, or any of them, shall enter into a commercial agreement with the United States, or make concessions in favor of the products, or manufactures thereof, which, in the judgment of the President, shall be reciprocal and equivalent, he shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to suspend, during the time of such agreement or concession, by proclamation to that effect, the imposition and collection of the duties mentioned in this act, on such article or articles so exported to the United States from such country or colony, and thereupon and

thereafter the duties levied, collected, and paid upon such article or articles shall be as follows, namely:"

(The following is paraphrased.)

Argols, or crude tartar, or wine lees, crude: 5 percent ad valorem.
Brandies, or other manufactured or distilled spirits: \$1.75 per proof gallon.

Champagne and all other sparkling wines: In bottles containing from 1 pint to 1 quart, \$6 per dozen; in bottles containing from one-half pint to 1 pint, \$3 per dozen; in bottles containing one-half pint or less, \$1.50 per dozen; in bottles or vessels containing more than 1 quart, in addition to \$6 per dozen bottles, on the quantities in excess of 1 quart at the rate of \$1.90 per gallon.

Still wines and vermouth: In casks, 35 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs, per case of 1 dozen each containing from 1 pint to 1 quart, or 24 bottles or jugs containing not more than 1 pint, \$1.25 per case; and any excess beyond these quantities found in such bottles or jugs, 4 cents per pint or fractional part thereof.

Paintings in oil or water colors, pastels, pen-and-ink drawings, and statuary: 15 percent ad valorem.

"The President shall have power, and it shall be his duty, whenever he shall be satisfied that any such agreement in the section mentioned is not being fully executed by the government with which it shall have been made, to revoke such suspension and notify such government thereof.

"And it is further provided that with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, whenever and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country, or any colony of such government, producing and exporting directly or indirectly to the United States coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States, which, in view of the introduction of such coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans into the United States as in this act hereinbefore provided for, he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend by proclamation to that effect the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, of the products of such country or colony, for such time as he shall deem just; and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon coffee, tea, and tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, and vanilla beans, the products or exports, direct or indirect, from such designated country, as follows:

"On coffee, 3 cents per pound.

"On tea, 10 cents per pound.

"On tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans, 50 cents per pound; vanilla beans, \$2 per pound; vanilla beans, commercially known as cuts, \$1 per pound."

III. LIST OF AGREEMENTS

France

Date of signature: May 28, 1898.

Date of proclamation under section 3: May 30, 1898 (30 Stat. 1774).

Scope of concessions received: Minimum French rates of duty secured for canned meats, lemons, oranges, mandarin oranges, table grapes, apples, pears, and other fruits (including both fresh and dried fruits), various classifications of timber and lumber, paving blocks, staves, hops, pork products, and lard.

Duration of agreement: No termination date specified. The agreement was apparently terminated by the Tariff Act of 1909.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 542.

Portugal

Date of signature: May 22, 1899.

Date of proclamation under section 3: June 12, 1900 (31 Stat. 1074).

Scope of concessions received: Reduction of duty rates to most-favored-nation level on flour other than wheat flour, maize, wheat, lard and grease, mineral oils and their products, reaping, mowing, and threshing machines, machines for compressing hay and straw, steam plows, parts of the foregoing machines and plowshares, agricultural implements, and tools. In addition, maximum duties are prescribed for certain of the mineral oils and for the machinery, implements, and tools.

Duration of agreement: Five years and thereafter terminable upon 1 year's notice with a special right to Portugal to terminate upon 3 months' notice in the event of imposition by the United States of any duty on Portuguese cork or coffee and in the event the United States failed to give most-favored-nation treatment on various other listed products of particular interest to Portugal.

Text of agreement appears in: 2 Malloy 1463.

Italy

Date of signature: February 8, 1900.

Date of proclamation under section 3: July 18, 1900 (31 Stat. 1079).

Scope of concessions received: Maximum duties specified for cottonseed oil, fish, agricultural machinery and parts, scientific instruments, dynamo electrical machines and parts, sewing machines, and varnishes; bound on the free list turpentine oil, natural fertilizers, skins, and furs.

Duration of agreement: Until December 31, 1903, and thereafter until 1 year's notice of termination.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 987.

Germany

Date of signature: July 10, 1900.

Date of proclamation under section 3: July 13, 1900 (31 Stat. 1079).

Scope of concessions received: Conventional tariff rates on all American products; annulment of German regulations requiring inspection of dried or evaporated fruits imported from the United States and binding of customs duties on such fruits.

Duration of agreement: Terminable upon 3 months' notice.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 558.

France—Amendatory agreement

Date of signature: August 20, 1902.

Date of proclamation under section 3: July 13, 1900.

Scope of agreement: The agreement of May 28, 1898, was made applicable to Algeria and Puerto Rico. France agreed that Puerto Rican coffee should until February 23, 1903, be entitled to minimum French duties.

Duration of agreement: To continue in force during the life of the agreement of May 28, 1898.

Text of agreement appears in 1 Malloy 543.

Portugal—Amendatory agreement

Date of signature: November 19, 1902.

Date of proclamation under section 3: January 24, 1907 (34 Stat. 3268).

Scope of agreement: The agreement of May 22, 1899, was made applicable to Puerto Rico.

Duration of agreement: The amendatory agreement was to continue in force during the life of the agreement of May 22, 1899.

Text of agreement appears in 2 Malloy 1466.

Germany—Special commercial arrangement in the form of an exchange of notes

Date of signature: February 18–19, 1906.

Date of proclamation under section 3: February 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 3192).

Scope of concessions received: German conventional tariff to be made applicable to all United States exports.

Duration of agreement: Until June 30, 1907.

Text of agreement appears in United States Foreign Relations (1906), part I, page 643.

Bulgaria—Agreement in the form of an exchange of notes

Date of signature: June 5–6, 1906.

Date of proclamation under section 3: September 15, 1906 (34 Stat. 5231).

Scope of concessions received: Bulgaria agreed to extend most-favored-nation treatment to exports of the United States.

Duration of agreement: Not specified.

Text of agreement appears in: United States Foreign Relations (1908), part I, page 141; sets forth in dispatches from the American diplomatic agent at Sofia the substance of the exchange of notes.

Spain

Date of signature: August 1, 1906; exchange of explanatory notes, December 20, 1906.

Date of proclamation under section 3: August 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 3227).

Scope of concessions received: Most-favored-nation treatment granted by Spain on all American exports. The explanatory notes of December 20, 1906, provide that United States exports shall pay the minimum Spanish tariff and shall be entitled to the benefit of all reductions granted by Spain in present or future agreements with other countries. The notes also provide that the Territories and possessions of the United States to which the general tariff laws of the United States are applicable are deemed to be covered by the agreement.

Duration of agreement: No time specified.

Text of agreement appears in: 2 Malloy 1718.

Germany

Date of signature: April 22, 1907.

Date of proclamation under section 3: May 2, 1907.

Scope of agreement: In addition to granting the concessions authorized by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, the United States agreed to make certain modifications in its customs and consular regulations, as described in a note from Secretary Root to the German Ambassador dated April 22, 1907, and attached to the agreement. Germany agreed to apply specified tariff rates to a long list of American export products which are set forth in seven and one-half pages of small print in a schedule attached to the agreement.

Duration of agreement: To remain in force until June 30, 1908, and thereafter to be terminable upon 6 months' notice.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 563.

Netherlands

Date of signature: May 16, 1907.

Date of proclamation under section 3: August 12, 1908 (35 Stat. 2198).

Scope of agreement: Maximum Netherlands duties are specified for mutton, salt pork, salt bacon, and canned meats in packages of more than 4 pounds. The United States, in addition to concessions authorized by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897, agreed to amend its instructions to customs officers.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite, but terminable upon 1 year's notice with the exception that the United States may terminate

upon 3 months' notice in the event that the Netherlands failed to give most-favored-nation treatment to any United States product.

Text of agreement appears in: 2 Malloy 1275.

Great Britain

Date of signature: November 19, 1907.

Date of proclamation under section 3: December 5, 1907 (35 Stat. 2163).

Scope of concessions received: Samples of dutiable goods brought into the United Kingdom by American commercial travelers to be exempt from inspection on importation on the basis of certification of the American customs authorities at the time of exportation.

Duration of agreement: To continue in force until after 6 months' notice of termination.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 813.

France—Supplementary agreement

Date of signature: January 28, 1908.

Date of proclamation under section 3: January 28, 1908 (35 Stat. 2178).

Scope of agreement: Food products of the United States and Puerto Rico except sugar and mineral oils of the United States to be admitted into France and Algeria at the French minimum tariff rates. The United States agreed to impose the reduced duties authorized by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897 on champagne and sparkling wines imported into the United States and Puerto Rico. In addition, each party agreed to appoint a commission of three experts to consider complaints with respect to the import regulations of the respective countries. Each commission was to report to its own government, which report was to form the basis of an exchange of views designed to remove, if possible, the causes of complaint considered in the report.

Duration of agreement: To remain in force during the life of the agreements of May 28, 1898, and August 20, 1902.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 547.

Spain—Supplementary agreement in the form of an exchange of notes

Date of signature: February 20, 1909.

Date of proclamation under section 3: February 20, 1909 (35 Stat. 2229).

Scope of agreement: The notes recite that in order to remove any possible ground for the exercise by the Government of Spain of its right under the agreement of August 1, 1906, to rescind any of its concessions made to the United States, the President of the United States deems the concessions made by Spain as reciprocal and equivalent to the reduced duties authorized by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897. Accordingly, the note of the United States stated that the President would issue a proclamation suspending the duties on sparkling wines imported from Spain and would substitute therefor the reduced duties authorized by section 3 of the Tariff Act of 1897.

Duration of agreement: No period specified. Presumably as this was supplementary to the agreement of August 1, 1906, the supplementary agreement was to continue for the life of the earlier agreement.

Text of agreement appears in: 2 Malloy 1721.

Italy—Supplementary agreement

Date of signature: March 2, 1909.

Date of proclamation under section 3: April 24, 1909 (36 Stat. 2492).

Scope of concessions received: Italy agreed to a specific maximum rate of duty on mowers and tedders imported from the United States.

Duration of agreement: To continue in effect until after 1 year's notice of termination.

Text of agreement appears in: 1 Malloy 994.

TWELVE EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO UNDER SECTION 3 OF THE MCKINLEY TARIFF ACT OF 1890 (26 STAT. 567, 612)

NOTE

I. The texts of all but two of these agreements appear in Senate Executive Document No. 119, Fifty-second Congress, first session (1892). The sources for the texts of the other two agreements (that with France and the second agreement with Salvador) are indicated hereafter in connection with the description of those two agreements.

II. Summary of section 3 of the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890:

"That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the first day of January 1892, whenever, and so often as the President shall be satisfied that the government of any country producing and exporting sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other exactions upon the agricultural or other products of the United States, which in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides into the United States he may deem to be reciprocally unequal and unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions of this act relating to the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, and in such case and during such suspension duties shall be levied, collected, and

paid upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, the product of or exported from such designated country as follows, namely:"

(The following is paraphrased.)

Sugar: Sugar of or below No. 13 Dutch standard in color, to pay duty according to polariscopic tests: If not above 75 degrees to pay seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; for every additional degree two one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound.

Sugar above No. 13 Dutch standard in color and of or below No. 16 to pay 1½ cents per pound.

Sugar between No. 17 and No. 20 to pay 1½ cents per pound.

Sugar above No. 20 to pay 2 cents per pound.

Molasses: If testing above 56 degrees to pay 4 cents per gallon.

Coffee: To pay 3 cents per pound.

Tea: To pay 10 cents per pound.

Hides and skins of various kinds, 1½ cents per pound.

III. LIST OF THE 12 EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS, EACH OF WHICH WAS IN THE FORM OF AN EXCHANGE OF NOTES

Brazil

Date on which agreement was reached: January 31, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: February 5, 1891 (26 Stat. 1563).

Scope of concessions received: Free entry covering 15 scheduled items and a 25-percent reduction, based on existing Brazilian rates, covering 9 other tariff items.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite; terminable on January 1 or July 1 of any year on 3 months' notice by either party.

Text: Senate Executive Document No. 119, page 28, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Dominican Republic

Date on which agreement was reached: June 4, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: August 1, 1891 (27 Stat. 986).

Scope of concessions received: Schedule of 32 items, free entry; schedule of 11 other items, 25-percent reduction based on existing general rates.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite; terminable at will of either party without notice.

Text: Senate Executive Document No. 119, page 48, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Spain (for Cuba and Puerto Rico)

Date on which agreement was reached: June 16, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: July 31, 1891 (27 Stat. 982).

Scope of concessions received: A temporary schedule, which was to be effective until July 1, 1892, carried 20 items on the free list, 4 items at specified rates, and 3 items at a 25-percent reduction in existing rates. This was to be superseded on the date mentioned by a permanent schedule providing free entry for 39 products, specified duties for 5, a 50-percent reduction for 17, and a 25-percent reduction for 14 products.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite; terminable at will.

Text: Senate Executive Document No. 119, page 35, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Guatemala

Date on which agreement was reached: December 30, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: May 18, 1892 (27 Stat. 1025).

Scope of concessions received: Schedule of 29 products to be admitted free of duty.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite, without provision for notice of termination by either party.

Text: Senate Executive Document No. 119, page 98, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Salvador

Date on which agreement was reached: December 30, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: December 31, 1891 (27 Stat. 996).

Scope of concessions received: Free entry for 46 scheduled products. This agreement was provisional and was to be superseded by a more "definite arrangement" (infra).

Duration of agreement: Not later than December 31, 1892. Terminable meanwhile upon 30 days' prior notice.

Text: Senate Executive Document, No. 119, page 89, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

German Empire

Date on which agreement was reached: August 22, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: February 1, 1892 (27 Stat. 1004).

Scope of concessions received: The United States obtained the benefit of the German Empire's conventional rates, effective February 1, 1892, on 41 tariff items as well as any future reductions which the latter government might establish by convention. The conventional rates were lower than the general rates in 21 of the 41 items, and all were bound against increase. A prohibition against the importation of American hogs, pork, and sausages was abolished.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite without specific provision for notice of termination by either party.

Text: Senate Executive Document, No. 119, page 108, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Great Britain (for certain West Indian colonies and Jamaica)

Date on which agreement was reached: December 29, 1891.

Date of proclamation under section 3: February 1, 1892 (27 Stat. 999).

Scope of concessions received: Separate schedules were applicable in the West Indian colonies and in Jamaica. That for the former provided free entry for 58 products, a 50-percent reduction in existing rates for 8 products, and a 25-percent reduction for 8 other products. The schedule covering imports into Jamaica contained a free list schedule covering 63 items, 50-percent reductions covering 5 items, and 25-percent reductions covering 5 others.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite, without provision for notice of termination.

Text: Senate Executive Document, No. 119, page 82, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Nicaragua

Date on which agreement was reached: March 11, 1892.

Date of proclamation under section 3: March 12, 1892 (27 Stat. 1009).

Scope of concessions received: Thirty-four scheduled products of the United States became entitled to free entry.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite, without a notice provision covering termination by either party.

Text: Senate Executive Document, No. 119, page 94, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

France

Date on which agreement was reached: March 13, 1892.

Never proclaimed.

Scope of concessions received: The French minimum tariff was accorded to eight scheduled products in this informal agreement. In addition, the removal of the French restriction on the importation of American pork was obtained. This had been imposed on sanitary grounds.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite.

Text: Departmental Archives, Diplomatic Dispatches, France, volume 107.

Honduras

Date on which agreement was reached: April 29, 1892.

Date of proclamation under section 3: April 30, 1892 (27 Stat. 1023).

Scope of concessions received: Free entry into Honduras was guaranteed for 46 products of the United States.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite. However, as the agreement was provisional on the part of Honduras, the United States reserved the privilege of terminating it on 30 days' prior notice if the Honduran Legislature should fail to take action authorizing a more comprehensive agreement or if such an agreement should not be concluded by January 1, 1893.

Text: Senate Executive Document No. 119, page 103, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Austria-Hungary

Date on which agreement was reached: May 3, 1892.

Date of proclamation under section 3: May 26, 1892 (27 Stat. 1026).

Scope of concessions received: The United States obtained the benefit of Austro-Hungarian conventional rates, established pursuant to six agreements with other European governments on about 179 tariff items. The conventional rates were all lower than the general rates which had theretofore been applicable to American products. The right to the benefit of any future reductions which Austria-Hungary might grant to third countries was also obtained.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite.

Text: Senate Executive Document No. 119, page 114, Fifty-second Congress, first session.

Salvador

Date on which agreement was reached: November 29, 1892.

Date of proclamation under section 3: December 27, 1893 (27 Stat. 1056).

Scope of concessions received: Free entry for 45 American products. This agreement superseded the "transitory" agreement, supra, effective January 1, 1893.

Duration of agreement: Indefinite, without specific provision for notice of termination.

Text: Departmental Archives, Diplomatic Dispatches, Central America, volume 55.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In connection with the suggestion made on the floor, the fact that the trade agreements tied the hands of Congress with respect to future action on matters covered in the agreements, although the answer was given that this is merely action taken pursuant to the authorization and policy which the present Congress deems desirable and necessary to effectuate its purpose, the further point can be made that, of course, if Senate ratification was required and the agreements were treaties this would be equally true, and, in fact, it is probable that if treaties were concluded they would not be for such short periods, since the President in negotiating the treaties would not be limited by the restrictions with respect to the duration laid down by the Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. President, I desire to detain the Senate for only a little while on the pending amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. It seems to me this amendment may be

repeated without undue loss of time of the Senate, in order that we may all clearly understand the issue presented by the amendment.

On page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1940", it is proposed to insert a comma and the following:

with the proviso that the authority conferred in the said act does not embrace authority to include in any trade-agreement negotiations excise taxes imposed under the provisions of paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) of subsection (c) of section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1932, as amended, which are now a part of the Internal Revenue Code, subtitle (c), chapter 29, subchapter (b), part 1, sections 3420, 3422, 3423, 3424, 3425.

Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Nevada in drafting his amendment took the trouble to refer to the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, giving the subsections thereof, because that very designation conclusively shows the nature of the sections to which he refers, and shows that while the duties are referred to here as excise duties, they are in fact import duties, and have been so treated by the Congress of the United States in codifying the revenue law.

I call attention to the fact that in the codification these sections do not appear under the heading of excise taxes, which are internal revenue taxes and have always been so considered in the revenue history of this country until this fake device was brought forward in the consideration and passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act; but they are included under the section devoted to import taxes. They are import taxes, Mr. President, as recognized by the codification of the laws unanimously passed by the Congress. They are import duties as recognized by the courts of the United States. They are import duties, as is fully set out in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, based upon court decisions and upon the codification of the law. So why should we not stop talking about excise duties and call them what they are? They are tariff duties, levied under the very terms of the act itself, in accordance with the practices, rules, and methods of collection with respect to every other tariff duty on articles coming into the United States.

Mr. President, I have heard the story that at one of President Lincoln's Cabinet meetings he turned to Secretary Seward, who was reported not to have been a great admirer of Lincoln's propensity for joking, and asked Seward, "If you were to call a sheep's tail a leg, how many legs would the sheep have?" Seward simply snorted and said, "Why, five, of course." Lincoln said, "Oh, no; it would not. It would have only four, because calling a sheep's tail a leg would not make it one." [Laughter.]

Calling these import duties excise taxes will not change the nature of the taxes. They are import duties—tariff levies—and ought to be considered as such.

We come down to the naked question whether or not there is anything in the peculiar situation of the commodities covered in these four sections, namely, petroleum, coal, lumber, and copper, which entitles them to be specially selected and set aside as a sacrosanct institution to which the provisions of the act should not be applicable. Except for the fact that the States which produce the commodities or are interested in the particular taxes have a very large representation in this body—more or less disproportionate to the population of those States—there is no reason on the face of the earth, Mr. President, why these duties should not stand on their own feet, the same as other duties contained in the various tariff acts of the United States which are the subject of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I do not say that the duty on copper ought to be reduced. I do not say that the duty on petroleum, lumber, or coal ought to be reduced. What I do say is that there is nothing sacred about those commodities which justifies the Congress of the United States in setting them aside and saying, "All the other hundreds of thousands of items contained in a tariff bill may be the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements, but you shall not lay your finger on these particular items because they are the Ark of the Covenant. They are sacred."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that there are many articles of importation into the United States with respect to which the proportion of imports to domestic production is much greater than in the case of oil, petroleum, copper, or lumber?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think that is unquestionably true. I know that certain Senators are very much interested in the production of flaxseed in this country. Why should they not say, "We want an excise duty, or a prohibitive tariff duty—which is what it amounts to—on flaxseed? You have established such a duty on copper, oil, coal, and lumber. Why should flaxseed be left out?"

Others might say, "We are interested in zinc, and we want a prohibitive tariff on zinc. Why should copper from Arizona and Montana have a prohibitive tariff, while zinc from Missouri and Oklahoma has not? Why should one be subject to the operation of this general law and the other not be?"

Many people in various sections of the country are interested in wheat. Others are interested in cotton. There are still some people interested in cotton in this country. Others are interested in countless other commodities; but the Congress of the United States is solemnly asked to pick out four separate tariff items—because that is what they are—and say, "These are sacred, and nothing must be done with them."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's thought, but his argument as to cotton reminds me of the fact that ever since I have been in the Senate, western Senators—and I am very happy to say that I have been one of them—have supported a subsidy for cotton, and have stood for the protection of cotton. I am now looking to my brethren from cotton-producing States to support copper so that we may keep on the employment rolls American citizens who constitute the red blood of this country, just as we have tried to protect the industry of the cotton-producing States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, by and large the representatives of every other commodity in this country have participated in the formulation of the program which has been in effect since the inauguration of President Roosevelt in 1933; but the proposal the Senator himself is advancing is that four particular commodities shall be selected out of all the thousands of commodities whose representatives have participated in the making of various policies—including the policy with regard to cotton—and that we shall say, "These are sacred, and you must not touch them."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. The statute itself sets forth one exception. The entire field of international trade is not opened by the pending measure. Subsection (b) of section 1 provides:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the application, with respect to rates of duty established under this section pursuant to agreements with countries other than Cuba, of the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on December 11, 1902—

That is the most important agreement of all with respect to the interests of many States of the Union—

or to preclude giving effect to an exclusive agreement with Cuba concluded under this section, modifying the existing preferential-customs treatment of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of Cuba.

That means that we can enter into an agreement with Cuba and eliminate in that agreement the most-favored-nation clause.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the fact that that provision goes back to an old international obligation of the United States growing out of the Spanish-American War.

Mr. BROWN. That is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not debating its wisdom; but it seems to me that is an essentially different question from selecting four commodities and saying, "These are sacrosanct and are to be excepted from the general operation of the Tariff Act."

Mr. BROWN. What is the effect of that clause? The effect of it is that Cuba is granted preferential treatment, not particularly with respect to Venezuela, Peru, or any other sugar-producing area, but with respect to the sugar industry of the United States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That may be. If the Senator should move to strike out that provision, the subject would be highly debatable. I can say to the Senator—because I was a member of the Finance Committee when this provision was first reported—that it was adopted simply to carry out an obligation which was assumed by treaty by the United States after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War. However, I still insist that that is entirely beside the point of selecting four commodities and having them made sacred.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly recall, the Tariff Act of 1930 and most previous tariff acts gave Cuba a preferential duty on sugar. While the duty was \$2.20, I believe, from other countries, a 20-percent differential was accorded to Cuba, because ever since the Spanish-American War we have recognized a sort of moral obligation toward and sponsorship of the Republic of Cuba, which we never felt toward any other country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We assumed it by formal action in the so-called Platt amendment, and in pursuance of that policy a similar provision was incorporated in every tariff act subsequently passed.

Mr. BROWN. It was the use of the word "sacrosanct" by the Senator that brought me to my feet. So far as the products of Michigan are concerned, all four of these commodities—coal, copper, oil, and lumber—are produced in the State of Michigan. We cannot be sacrosanct as to those products, but we can be as to the products of the island of Cuba; and that is what rather disturbs me in regard to this legislation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has kindly called my attention to the provision of the Tariff Act of 1930, section 316:

CUBAN RECIPROCITY TREATY NOT AFFECTED

Nothing in this act shall be construed to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on December 11, 1902, or the provisions of the act of December 17, 1903, chapter 1.

So in that section of the act to which the Senator has referred the United States in the Tariff Act of 1930 was simply carrying out its treaty obligations to the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator will permit me further, when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which was passed in 1930, was enacted, of course, there were set up certain standards and certain tariff rates that may have been beneficial to the State of Michigan and to the Middle West. They were fixed and established within reasonable limitations. In consideration of those rates it was all right for us to agree to this arrangement with respect to Cuba, but when we come to this legislation—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It had already been agreed to long since, I will say to the Senator, by treaty between the United States and Cuba, ratified back in 1902.

Mr. BROWN. That is true, but when we come to this agreement we fix and establish the arrangements with Cuba, and do not permit the President to interfere with those. However, when it comes to rates that are effective in my State of Michigan, we permit the President to do almost anything he wants to do with respect to those rates. So I say it is a different situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I say, too, it is a different situation. I say that the situation with regard to Cuba is a peculiar situation made necessary by the fact that the

United States saw fit to enter into a treaty which has been carried out in our tariff legislation. I refer to section 320 of the Tariff Act of 1922, containing a provision, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, exactly similar to the provision of the act of 1930. So there can be no question whatever as to the fact that we were bound by treaty obligations, and it seems to me that that situation is not in any way comparable to that of selecting particular commodities for special treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the section of the Tariff Act referred to by the Senator from Missouri will be printed in the RECORD.

The section referred to is as follows:

SEC. 320. That nothing in this act shall be construed to abrogate or in any manner impair or affect the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on December 11, 1902, or the provisions of the act of December 17, 1903, chapter 1.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, much has been said here about certain so-called commitments which were made in the Senate and in the Congress in connection with the passage of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934 and again by its extension in 1937. I read part of the RECORD this morning. I think it would be beneficial to call the attention of the Senate again to precisely what happened on that subject and to the whole of it. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] toward the close of the consideration of the original act of 1934 proposed an amendment which would freeze these commodities under the duties called excise taxes. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] objected very strenuously and the Senator from Mississippi withdrew that amendment, which, in turn, was then offered by the then Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, and overwhelmingly defeated by the Senate by a vote of 29 to 57, or nearly 2 to 1.

In that debate after the Senator from Mississippi had offered his amendment, the Senator from Arizona said:

Mr. President, I have taken no time on this bill; and we are to vote, I believe, in 10 minutes. Will not the Senator from Mississippi withdraw this statement? I do not want to be required to speak against the amendment, but there are a dozen Members on this side of the Chamber who ought to do so, and we have only 10 minutes. Will the Senator now at the last hour draw a dirk? Will the Senator please withdraw his amendment? Is the Senator proposing—

With the frankness which always distinguishes the Senator from Arizona and charms his associates in this body on all occasions, the Senator from Arizona was candid enough to state the reason why he did not want any agreement made as to "freezing" the rates—

Is the Senator proposing to go to the country with a bill which will preclude the President from raising the tariffs on oil, copper, and lumber?

I oppose that amendment. No man who pretends to be fair would, after discussion upon this bill has been practically completed, draw from his breast a dirk against these great industries.

I have always been in favor of a proposal to give the President the power to raise tariffs and lower them, to get away from logrolling—

Which is what we are trying to do in this measure—

and it ill becomes the able Senator at this hour, when no one can make reply to him, to propose such an amendment. It is conceived in iniquity, it is born in sin, and generated in unfairness.

I regret to apply this last remark of my great and distinguished friend from Arizona to the amendment pending before the Senate offered by my great and distinguished friend from Nevada, but I am compelled to do so because the proposition involved in the two amendments is precisely the same.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if I had walked into the Senate Chamber not knowing what had previously occurred, and that language had been read, I would know it was mine. I recognize my own rhetoric.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am very happy to bear witness that no Senator in this Chamber could possibly compare in rhetoric with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I might say that I have great tenacity, but it is tempered with tremendous flexibility.

Mr. President, I think I ought not to be silent in the situation because the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is a man so able, so learned, and so pungent in argument that what he says is always worthy of consideration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not rise to disclaim or explain anything. My policy in life has been never to explain because if today one explains tomorrow he will be explaining his explanation. When this administration came into power I profoundly believed that it would be a high-tariff administration.

Possibly I had sweetbreads for brains when I so believed. Suffice it to say that I believed it, and I had reason to believe it, and I believe now that if the Roosevelt administration goes on the rocks it will be because it has not been a high-tariff administration.

Mr. President, now, as to that somewhat gorgeous rhetoric, I wish to say that the debate had practically closed on that occasion; in fact, I think each Senator was allowed but 5 minutes, and I could not, nor could any other Senator, explain in 5 minutes that which was understood by all responsible persons, to wit, that there was an agreement on all sides, including the administration, that the tariff on copper would be raised. Believing that the tariff on copper would be raised, believing that it should be raised, I could not consent to an amendment which would preclude the President from raising the tariff on copper.

I would today vote to give the President the power to raise or increase the tariff.

I am a high-tariff man and for that I make no apology. I have in season, and many of my brother Senators, think perhaps out of season, championed high tariffs. Perhaps I am trespassing too long on the time of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am delighted to have the Senator say anything he desires on my time.

Mr. ASHURST. This is not the occasion to speak, much as I should delight to do so, of the beneficent effect of high tariffs on our country. I may be old-fashioned or I may be reactionary, but I believe in high tariffs, and I have never failed in the past 20 years to advocate high tariffs. If someone advocating low tariffs should be a candidate for office in the West, in my judgment he would not be elected.

It may be asked, Why, therefore, are you so interested? The answer is if I do not stand for high tariffs, Arizona will send someone here who will have the courage to stand for high tariffs. I have an election approaching. I would be disingenuous and lacking in frankness if I should pretend that I am putting this question upon a more exalted plane. Arizona will see to it that I am displaced by a high-tariff man if I fail to do my duty here.

Now, if the Senator will pardon me for a few moments more—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I speak this afternoon with mingled feelings of duty and gratitude. It is my duty to speak for high tariffs on this floor because I am thus representing the views of my people and of the West in speaking for high tariffs.

It will be 28 years tomorrow since I was inducted into the Senate. No Senator has ever been treated more generously by his constituents than have I. Not only have they repeatedly reelected me but they have done that which few States have ever done to or for any Senator—allowed him to do almost as he pleased. For that I am profoundly grateful to Arizona. No words at my command can express to the people of Arizona the gratitude I feel to them for so long sustaining me here and almost always giving me the right to act as I thought best. Other States may have paralleled that action in generosity toward a Senator. None has ever excelled it in generosity toward a Senator.

Therefore if I fall in any way in the Senate I have no alibi. The people have given me the privilege of doing what I think

proper and right, and if I fail it is my own fault. Whatever may be my shortcomings, since I became converted to the high-tariff policy I have not failed on any proper occasion to advocate high tariffs.

May I trespass for another 5 minutes on the time of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to say, not as a mere gesture—I do not say this as a friendly Senatorial courtesy respecting the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]—that long before I came to the Senate I recognized him not only as an expert in parliamentary law, but as a student of treaties and of tariffs; and while the words of affection I have toward him come from my heart, they are words that one student might say about another in recognition of his ability and his diligence; but I disagree with him on the tariff. He believes in low tariffs. He has abundant historical, even party, authority for it.

Mr. President, why am I so much interested in copper tariff? Why my solicitude for copper tariffs? First, whether destiny is kind or unkind in building a State largely around a particular industry is for someone else to decide. Suffice it to say that, while Arizona has great lumbering interests, while she has great livestock and agricultural interests and possibilities, while her tourist trade is remarkably great, and her many dude ranches and her many places of majestic scenery attract persons, and while she produces all the precious, rare, and base metals, except oil and coal, she is engaged largely in the production of copper. Copper, directly or indirectly, pays about one-half of all the taxes paid in Arizona. Copper employs about one-half of all the persons employed in Arizona. I should be a poor representative of Arizona, if I did not have a solicitude and at least a friendly attitude toward the major industry of my own State.

I know how tiresome and tiresome figures are; but let me, with the Senator's further kind permission, read some data about the copper industry in Arizona.

In round numbers, from the year 1874—the year of my birth—down to 1939, Arizona produced \$2,816,000,000 worth of copper, and this sum of money was expended as follows: For wages and salaries, \$938,000,000; for supplies and equipment, \$586,000,000; for taxes, State and Federal, \$251,000,000; for freight on copper, \$157,000,000; for refining, \$173,000,000; for selling, \$34,000,000; for insurance and replacements, and so forth, \$130,000,000; for dividends, \$547,000,000. These are round numbers.

Making, as I said before, a total of \$2,816,000,000 of copper which Arizona has produced since I first saluted the dawn.

Mr. President, during the year 1937—I have no figures available since the year 1937—in the copper mines of the United States there were employed 24,900 persons, and in the copper smelters, mills, plants, and auxiliary works there were employed 22,315 persons, making a total of 47,215. These 47,215 employed persons subsisted about half a million persons.

Mr. President, withdraw the excise tax, and many, if not most, of the copper mines and smelters in the West would fall into delinquency, would fall into disrepair; they would be abandoned. The plumes of smoke that now pour forth from the smelters would no longer be in the sky. The flashes of light from the smelters would no longer illuminate the midnight sky. Thousands of persons who are now employed at good wages would tread the streets of the towns and the copper camps, asking for employment; the dust of the desert would cover and the reptilia of the desert would soon inhabit those copper towns that have been built around the copper camps. Towns noted for their beauty and order, towns in which have been built temples of religion, temples of art, and temples of industry, would be destroyed under a doctrine of free trade or low tariffs.

Mr. President, it would be discourteous and impolite for me to trespass further upon the time of the able Senator from Missouri; but I thank him for giving me this opportunity to say a word.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator from Arizona make remarks in any remarks I make whenever he so desires. I desire further to say that, much as I disagree with what I consider the very erroneous views of the Senator from Arizona on the tariff, so far as his service in this body is concerned the State of Arizona has honored itself as much as it has honored him by his repeated reelections.

It was not my purpose to enter into a debate as to these particular items; but, since the Senator has mentioned copper, I only desire to call his attention to the fact that the exportations of copper from this country—of course, we all recognize that copper is an export industry—increased from \$16,065,000 in 1932 to \$44,244,000 in 1936 and \$79,492,000 in 1939.

I do not say that the reciprocal-trade agreements were entirely responsible for this increase; but I do call attention to the fact that the exportations of this great export commodity, copper, have multiplied under the Hull reciprocal trade agreements policy as against the exportations at the time of the beneficent Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act. I further direct attention to the fact that exports of copper to non-trade-agreement countries have increased only 53.1 percent as against 74.1 percent to trade-agreement countries. So, Mr. President, in any way we please to take it, the record is favorable to the trade agreements.

Furthermore, in the case of another one of the commodities subject to these excise taxes, against the eloquent testimony of the Senator from Arizona as to the benefits which have come to the United States and the various industries of the United States I set the testimony of a very able and distinguished man, Dr. Wilson Compton, the technical head and adviser of the lumber industry of the United States, who said in a letter on December 22, 1938, addressed to the Lumber Manufacturers' Association:

It is a mathematical certainty that during the past 10 years the industry has lost in foreign markets a greater volume of trade than it has gained through protection in domestic markets.

Mr. President, on the question of what the RECORD shows as to the promises which were held out either at the time of the enactment of the original trade-agreements measure or at the time of the consideration in 1937 of its extension, I desire to conclude by reading part of the proceedings of June 4, 1937, when the Long amendment was offered and rejected by the Senate, because it seems to me the action of the Senate on this matter is absolutely conclusive.

After the remarks of the Senator from Arizona which I read a few moments ago the following occurred:

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there are only a few moments remaining before the time for voting. I desire to say to the Senator from Arizona that I have offered this amendment in order to help his contention. I shall gladly withdraw the proposal.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator will pardon me. I have only 3 minutes on this bill.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator desires to have the amendment withdrawn, I shall be delighted to withdraw it.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire to have any amendment withdrawn which precludes the President from raising the tariff on copper.

Then there was some colloquy between the then Senator from Delaware, Mr. Hastings, and the then Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, which resulted in the Senator from Louisiana reoffering the amendment for freezing the excise import duties upon the four commodities. I read further from the RECORD:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask the yeas and nays on that amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am willing to have a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. I desire to be heard for a minute.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I am willing to take my chances. I am willing to leave it to Franklin D. Roosevelt as to whether or not the tariff shall be increased.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I refuse to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. LONG. I have but 5 minutes, and the Senator from Arizona has already spoken for 5 minutes.

Mr. President, we were given to understand and we were assured that copper, oil, coal, and lumber would not be affected by this bill; and, as one of the Senators who had received this assurance—

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. No; I will not yield, Mr. President. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to know what effect the assurance the Senator received had on him. He apparently is not going to vote for the bill, anyway.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not know what effect it had, except that I took them at their word.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that I withdrew the amendment.

Mr. LONG. I am not censuring the Senator from Mississippi. I am offering his amendment, which I presume he will support.

And which he did not support.

I believe he will.

Mr. President, we were told that these commodities would be protected because the tariffs we have on oil and lumber and coal and copper are very necessary.

I again call attention to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Long, with that frankness which was one of his great characteristics, did not attempt to call these excise duties, did not attempt to confuse them with internal-revenue taxes, but called them tariff duties. I continue the quotation:

Mr. President, we were told that these commodities would be protected because the tariffs we have on oil and lumber and coal and copper are very necessary. A number of Senators and I fought here many nights and many days to get tariffs on these items, and we want to protect them. We were assured that they would be protected. Today, as an example, notwithstanding the fact it is said we have an overproduction of oil in America, nonetheless we are importing into the country 260,000 barrels of oil a day. Notwithstanding all our lumber trouble and the cheapness of lumber, lumber is still being imported. We were told—and we believed—and I am sure Senators mean to stick by it, that we should have this tariff protection, and it would be disastrous to us if it were not given to us.

I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the yea-and-nay vote in the Senate on June 4, 1934, on the Long amendment, the result being, yeas 29, nays 57, which I insist is the pronouncement of policy upon this question by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HERRING in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the yea-and-nay vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FESS (when his name was called). Repeating my statement made previously with reference to my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LEWIS (when Mr. NEELY's name was called). I am authorized to state that were the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when his name was called). Announcing the same pair and its transfer as on previous votes, I vote "nay."

Mr. STEPHENS (when his name was called). I repeat my former announcement as to my pair and transfer and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HEBERT. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], if present, would vote "yea" on this question. He is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. McADOO], as announced by the transfer of the pair of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. OVERTON. I inquire if the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That Senator is not recorded as having voted.

Mr. OVERTON. I am paired with that Senator, and in his absence withhold my vote.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 57, as follows:

Yeas, 29: Austin, Barbour, Carey, Coolidge, Couzens, Cutting, Davis, Dickinson, Fletcher, Frazier, Gibson, Goldsborough, Hale, Hastings, Hatfield, Hebert, Johnson, Kean, Keyes, Long, McNary, Metcalf, Schall, Stelwer, Thomas of Oklahoma, Townsend, Vandenberg, Walcott, and White.

Nays, 57: Adams, Ashurst, Bachman, Bailey, Bankhead, Barkley, Black, Bone, Borah, Brown, Bulkley, Bulow, Byrd, Byrnes, Capper, Caraway, Clark, Connally, Copeland, Costigan, Dieterich, Dill, Duffy, Erickson, George, Harrison, Hatch, Hayden, La Follette, Lewis, Logan, Lonergan, McCarran, McGill, McKellar, Murphy, Norbeck, Norris, Nye, O'Mahoney, Patterson, Pittman, Pope, Reynolds, Robinson of Arkansas, Russell, Sheppard, Shipstead, Smith, Stephens, Thomas of Utah, Thompson, Tydings, Van Nuys, Wagner, Walsh, and Wheeler.

Not voting, 10: Fess, Glass, Gore, King, McAdoo, Neely, Overton, Reed, Robinson of Indiana, Trammell.

So Mr. Long's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate by reading from the record the entire colloquy which took place on this subject in the Committee on Finance in 1937, but I do desire to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks certain quotations from the hearings before the Finance Committee on this subject on February 10, 11, 12, and 15, 1937, particularly colloquies between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], Assistant Secretary of State Sayre, and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From hearings before Committee on Finance, United States Senate, February 1940, pp. 34-40]

Senator VANDENBERG. Dr. Sayre, under what clause of the law which you invoke to reach into the internal taxes would you also consider that you had the power to reach into the excise taxes on oil and copper and such?

Dr. SAYRE. The particular taxes to which you refer on oil and copper, and so forth, if I remember correctly, are levied upon importations, and I believe that there is a specific provision in section 601 of the Revenue Act, which is the one to which I think you refer, that they shall be treated as import taxes. Under that provision the Trade Agreements Act does delegate to the President the power to affect those particular excise taxes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. Senator HARRISON made the statement on the floor of the Senate—I have it here somewhere—that specifically it was not the intention, either of the House or the Senate, to give you any power to deal with those excise taxes. Now, do you disagree with Senator HARRISON on that?

Mr. SAYRE. All I can do, sir, is to quote you the law. Under the law, you will remember, as I read a few moments ago, the President is authorized to proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign-trade agreements, as are required or are appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder. To that I would add the provision of section 601 of the revenue act which states that—

Senator VANDENBERG. At any rate, you interpret the situation which you are asking us to extend as giving you authority to reduce the excise taxes on oil, copper, and so forth?

Mr. SAYRE. To reduce, Senator, or to—

Senator VANDENBERG. To freeze?

Mr. SAYRE. To freeze; yes, sir. If I may read you the language of section 601, I think that is made clear.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by "freezing," Doctor?

Mr. SAYRE. Continuing without raising.

Senator VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator from Texas heard this answer, that he thinks his authority is broad enough even to affect the excise taxes on oil, copper, and so forth.

Mr. SAYRE. Under the provisions of section 601.

Senator VANDENBERG. Yes.

Senator CONNALLY. I understood that.

Senator VANDENBERG. When it passed the Senate it was specifically stated by the Senator from Mississippi on the floor that that power did not exist under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got my statement there? I think I said it froze these propositions.

Senator VANDENBERG. No; your statement was a very gorgeous one—very conclusive.

Mr. SAYRE. Senator Vandenberg, these are, as you understand, under the language of section 601, treated as import taxes so that they could be frozen or they could be reduced.

Senator VANDENBERG. Senator Harrison asked me to read what he said—

The CHAIRMAN. I don't care anything about it, I will read it myself.

Senator VANDENBERG. I think I better read it now. On June 4, 1934, at page 10391 of the RECORD, the able chairman said:

"It will be noted that, so far as tariff rates are concerned, the President has the power to increase or lower them by 50 percent; but as to excise taxes, they may be continued. It was the intention of those who framed the legislation, and of the House in passing the bill, that they would be frozen; in other words, they might not be modified."

Is that your interpretation?

Mr. SAYRE. My interpretation is simply the reading of the law. I read you the provision in the Trade Agreements Act. I do not seem to have available here section 601 of the revenue act, but it contains a provision which directs that those particular excise taxes, which are levied on importations, shall be treated to all intents and purposes under the law as import taxes. As such, I presume they would be subject to either freezing or reduction under some trade agreement which might be made.

Senator VANDENBERG. Well, the importance to us is that you are now asking us to extend the power, and it is important to know which power you will contemplate using.

Senator CLARK. Dr. Sayre, let me understand this proposition correctly. I have been very much in sympathy with the reciprocal-trade agreements and feel that they have accomplished a great deal of good. But do I understand your proposition to be that in case of gasoline, let us say, on which we have levied an excise tax for years in this country—a nuisance tax, to be sure, but nevertheless an excellent revenue producer for the absolute necessities of the Government, and which this committee and the Congress have never found an opportunity to take off, although it is a burdensome tax by reason of the fact that the necessity for revenue is too desperate—do I understand that if the State Department was to happen to include gasoline in one of the reciprocal-trade agreements that that would automatically, if the State Department chose to do it, reduce or wipe out a tax that the Congress had been levying as an internal excise tax for its purposes?

Mr. SAYRE. No, sir. That is what I fear might be misunderstood from Senator VANDENBERG's question. There is no such power under the Trade Agreements Act.

Senator CLARK. I certainly did not understand that there was one when we passed the act.

Senator VANDENBERG. What power do you contemplate you have with respect to the internal tax on gasoline?

Mr. SAYRE. We have no power to do anything with respect to the internal tax on domestically produced gasoline. I come back to the language of the Trade Agreements Act, sir.

Senator CONNALLY. This is an excise tax on imported gasoline now.

Senator VANDENBERG. As I understand the Secretary, he says he has the power to deal with it.

Mr. SAYRE. I come back to the language of the act, which is that the President is authorized to proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions—and this next is the language which concerns the matter—"or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements."

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Sayre, since they brought my name into this discussion, for which I am sorry, it will be recalled that in the debate, as shown on page 10391 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 1934, there came up some questions about this, and I stated I was offering an amendment.

Senator VANDENBERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that amendment sought to freeze these excise duties, in particular on lumber, I think it was, copper, oil, and coal. When I offered that I thought a certain gentleman of the Senate would be glad to receive it, but he made an objection, one of the Senators did, and I had to withdraw it. Afterward the Senator from Louisiana offered it and it was objected to. * * *

Senator VANDENBERG. And it has bound the hands of Congress in respect to internal taxation?

Mr. SAYRE. No; that is putting it too strongly, sir; not in regard to internal taxation; only with regard to these very peculiar excise taxes on imported products. * * *

Congress has delegated to the President the power to reduce tariffs on certain commodities and to bind United States excise taxes with respect to those imported commodities during the life of the trade agreement, but that does not cover internal taxation as such. It covers only excise taxes on imports. It covers only what is included in the specific language of this act.

Senator VANDENBERG. But an excise tax is an import tax so far as the net result is concerned?

Mr. SAYRE. Yes; insofar as imported goods are concerned; such an excise is a form of duty. But when you say the trade agreements give to the President the power to bind internal taxation, that is not true, because these excise taxes are only a very minor part of our internal-tax structure.

Senator CLARK. In this illustration that I asked you about a moment ago, this gasoline tax which is on the books right now is an excise tax. By every theory of taxation, the only theory on which it is imposed is as an excise tax. The same is true of all these nuisance taxes, the tax on jewelry, the tax on furs that we have, all of them are excise taxes. They are so classified by every tax authority and every lawyer that I have ever heard make a classification.

Senator VANDENBERG. Would you say you had the power to agree with England that the internal tax on British cigarettes sold in this country could not be raised?

Mr. SAYRE. I would want to consult a good many lawyers before I answered a question like that, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. I think, on the basis of the Brazilian precedent, your answer would be "yes."

Mr. SAYRE. I would want to consult a good many lawyers.

Senator VANDENBERG. Then we better consult a good many lawyers before we extend this act.

Mr. SAYRE. Remember, Senator—I come back again and again to this—that these excise taxes are very peculiar, that with a single exception there has been no binding of them apart from the trade agreements with Colombia, with Brazil, and with Cuba. In those trade agreements excise taxes on imported goods were bound only with respect to commodities largely tropical and not directly competitive with commodities in this country. * * *

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in the Finance Committee hearings on House Joint Resolution 96 references were made by several witnesses to the matter of internal taxes, excise taxes, and related subjects under the trade-agreements program. The following witnesses commented on this phase: Mr. Holman, pages 296, 297, 298; Mr. Wheeler,

pages 325, 326; and Mr. Loomis, pages 505, 506. The testimony of these gentlemen was directed, however, to the broad question of "binding the hands of Congress respecting internal taxes," and did not relate solely to the questionable authority of the President to modify the excise taxes on coal, oil, lumber, and copper.

When the joint resolution was being considered in executive session by the Finance Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] offered the following amendment:

Provided, That after the enactment of this resolution no trade agreement shall include any provision in any way limiting the power of Congress over internal taxes.

This amendment was rejected in the committee by a vote of 13 to 5.

It might be pointed out that the report of the Finance Committee contains reference to the continuance of excise treatment under the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and it is naturally implied that the previous position taken by the Department is approved by the committee in its report.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, lest what I said a moment ago might be construed as a reflection on Secretary Hull, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me to make a short statement regarding the Secretary of State?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. There is no man now alive for whom I have greater respect than the present Secretary of State, Mr. Hull. Indeed, I believe that his conduct of our foreign relations has been as able and as noble as that of any previous Secretary of State, and in many particulars shines like a beacon light on a dark and stormy ocean. The fact that I think he is wrong in his view as to these reciprocal-trade agreements, and that I believe they are baleful to our country, does not indicate that I have lessened in my affection and respect for Secretary Hull as a man. Indeed, it would be very dull to have to go through life and be required to agree with one merely because we were fond of him. At times we disagree with Senators although we may have great affection for them, and while I think that the Secretary of State is in error in his conclusions as to these trade treaties, and while I believe they will lead to no good to our country, and certainly no good to the Democratic Party, I should be lacking in fairness if I failed to say that I esteem the Secretary of State as a worthy man and high-minded official of great ability.

Moreover, Mr. President, I am not irritated because the able Senator from Missouri has adverted to the colloquy of 1934. It is legitimate debate. He would be derelict in the performance of his duty to present his case if he did not direct our attention to what occurred on the occasion to which he refers.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator, if I may, that I refer to that colloquy only for the purpose of establishing what the understanding and belief in the Senate were at that time.

Mr. ASHURST. I am so persuaded of the fairness and propriety of presenting the colloquy that I had intended to be in the Chamber at 12 o'clock today and to make a short speech referring to it myself, to show how much we may be mistaken in our estimates of men and measures. It seems odd when we reflect that I could have believed in 1934 that Franklin D. Roosevelt as President, and Secretary Hull as Secretary of State, would have increased the tariff. I believed that, and so did many other men whose processes of thought and avenues of information were more nearly accurate than my own.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to refer to just one or two remarks in the testimony which I have just obtained permission to have inserted in the RECORD, and to give a brief summary of the colloquy, because the question of the power and authority of the administration, of the President of the United States to change the taxes on these very four items was the subject of the debate. It was brought up

by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] who asked the direct question of the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Sayre, as to whether he considered that under the provisions of the act which was then sought to be extended the President had a right to interfere with excise taxes. Mr. Sayre explicitly replied that it was his construction and that of the State Department that under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, having in mind the provisions of section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1932, which specifically made those excise duties part of the Tariff Act of 1930, the President did have the right to change those excise duties. Then I asked the Assistant Secretary whether he meant to be understood by that answer as contending that the President or the State Department had the power to change domestic excise taxes, such as the tax on cigarettes, or the tax on beer or whisky, or the tax on gasoline or the so-called nuisance taxes, and the Assistant Secretary of State drew a clear and inescapable distinction between the two classes of excise taxes, one being so-called excise taxes on imports which, by the terms of section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1932, were specifically import duties, and the other being the ordinary internal-revenue taxes in this country, with which we have always been familiar. He contended that it was the opinion of the State Department that the first, that is, the import excise duties, were affected and subject to the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and that the others were not.

Every member of the committee understood that. I think every member of the Senate understood it, and when the measure came to the Senate floor the Senator from Michigan offered an amendment to the joint resolution extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act not dealing with these four specific duties, but merely asserting that the President did not have authority to change excise taxes. I have forgotten what the vote was, but he got hardly enough votes to count, and did not even have a roll call on it. So the record, so far as any promises, or agreements, or understandings as to what was to be done on this matter are concerned, is not as my good friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] understood it to be, from his statement this morning.

Mr. President, I insist that the action of the Senate itself on June 4, 1934, in voting down the Long amendment freezing these four excise taxes, is an indication that the Senate did not want to do what is proposed to be done now under the amendment pending before the Senate. I submit that there is no rhyme or reason or justification whatever for merely picking four items out of a thousand items in a tariff bill and saying, "These are sacred. We have to be sure that these particular items are to be sacred before we will let you enter on a broad policy of upbuilding the foreign trade of the United States, and promoting the domestic prosperity of the United States."

Mr. HARRISON rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make some remarks?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS (and other Senators). Vote! Vote!

Mr. HARRISON. I may suggest to the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators who suggest a vote, that some Senators had been assured that they could leave today, and that no vote would be taken today, because we have an agreement to limit debate tomorrow.

LOANS MADE UNDER RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be remembered that week before last, in debate in the Senate on the agricultural appropriation bill, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] took issue with respect to the accounting and the work done under the rural-electrification program, and said he had been unable to obtain information concerning that organization of the Government. He said particularly, as I recall, that he had been refused information concerning it; and at that time I promised to secure that information and present it to the Senate. I have that information, and I

shall now present it. The Senator also said he had seen little or no evidence that the loans to be made under the Rural Electrification Act "are really good loans," and declared that we ought to have figures to support the contention that the R. E. A. loans are good loans. I agree that we should have; but I do not agree that such evidence is not available. There is plenty of evidence, and I shall present some of it as well as I can in a limited time.

I am profoundly interested in the rural-electrification program, both in my own State of Tennessee and in the Nation generally. The reasons are not far to seek. Countless farmers tell us—and I know it is true—that our Government has inaugurated few activities that have meant as much to the farm family—in the terms of increased comfort, shortened hours of labor, lightened drudgery, and in general a happier and worthier way of life—as the R. E. A. program. Because of the contribution R. E. A. has already made, and promises to continue to make, to the betterment of farm life—because of its fine social and human values—I want to see its work go on.

The achievement of R. E. A., now rounding out its fifth year of financing electric distribution systems to serve the farmers of the United States, is well known. I need do no more than summarize briefly the high points of its program. Since its establishment in May 1935, R. E. A. has allotted approximately \$270,000,000 to 689 borrowers, designed to finance a quarter of a million miles of new rural electric lines and a few generating plants that will make service available to 850,000 farm families and other rural users. By the end of February 1940, 579 R. E. A. financed systems had been energized. These included 190,000 miles of lines, with 463,000 consumers already connected, and thousands more being added each month. In addition, the work of R. E. A. has acted as a powerful stimulus to the rural-development programs of private utility companies. In 1935, when rural electrification was practically at a standstill, power-company executives declared that rural lines were being extended as rapidly as was economically feasible. Yet since that date, and since the Rural Electrification Administration program got under way, the private utilities have extended electric service to nearly as many additional farms as they had undertaken to serve in the preceding quarter century. In the light of their lethargy earlier, I think it is only fair to credit R. E. A. with a large share in awakening the private companies to the opportunities of present-day rural electrification and in promoting the extension of service by R. E. A. borrowers and by the utilities, in less than 5 years, to nearly a million additional farms. For a more detailed account of the progress of rural electrification I call the Senate's attention to the statement inserted at page 4923 of the RECORD of March 21, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

The Administrator of R. E. A., in his annual report for 1939, submitted to the Congress on February 16, pointed out in some detail the reasons why this unprecedented expansion of rural electric service has been possible. Under R. E. A. financing the cost of constructing a mile of rural line has been sharply cut, from an average of around \$1,500 a mile to something like \$750. Simplification of construction, adoption of assembly-line methods, building of comparatively large mileages under contracts let after competitive bidding—all these factors have contributed to the economy of R. E. A. construction. More important from the social point of view, R. E. A. has insisted on the fullest possible development of a given area, taking electric service to every farm that could possibly be served, in clear and telling contrast to the older practice of utility companies, which "skimmed the cream" by serving only the more prosperous farms and condemning the less well off to years of darkness and drudgery.

The question is often raised, "How is it possible for R. E. A. borrowers to extend electric service on a self-liquidating basis if private utilities cannot do so?" That question has been asked more than once. It was implied in some of the remarks made in the debate on the appropriation for R. E. A. here last Thursday. It is a fair question, and one which every

friend of rural electrification is glad to answer. One answer, I think, is the fact I have already cited—that since the establishment of R. E. A. the private utilities have come to realize that widespread rural electrification is economically feasible. No more convincing evidence is needed than the 600,000 farms to which they have extended service in the past 4 or 5 years. And yet, as Mr. Slattery's report shows, there is even more convincing evidence. Referring to the more favorable areas in which R. E. A. has financed new electric lines, Mr. Slattery states:

No further proof is required of the bright prospects of the R. E. A. systems serving these areas than the repeated unsuccessful attempts the utilities have since made to buy them out.

In the less favorable areas, as the annual report of R. E. A. further demonstrates, the combination of strict economy in construction with education for fuller and more productive use of the newly acquired electric power has produced a very healthy outlook for most of these systems. And with the growing sense of cooperation among the farmers served by these lines, and their increasing knowledge of the value of electricity when wisely and liberally used, the outlook seems to become steadily healthier.

The junior Senator from Ohio alluded on Thursday to what he considers a great dearth of specific information on the financial condition of these R. E. A. financed cooperatives. He seemed to think that no facts at all were available. On the contrary, we find that the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee contain considerable information on the payments and defaults of nearly 100 R. E. A. borrowers. The annual report of the Administrator—whose accuracy certainly I would never impugn—presents a series of facts that encourage my belief in the soundness of R. E. A. loans and R. E. A. In particular I should like to call attention to the following very pertinent statements appearing on pages 134–135 of the R. E. A. report:

NO CHARGE-OFFS OR LOSSES

Under the Rural Electrification Act, the Rural Electrification Administration advances 100 percent of the funds necessary not only for the building of the line but for other overhead incident to the construction loan—such items as engineering fees, legal fees, etc. Not a dollar of the loans, totaling over \$176,000,000 advanced up to December 1, 1939, has been charged off by R. E. A. or transferred to an inactive account, although in financial experience generally such charge-offs are quite common. No losses have been experienced on any loans, and there have been no foreclosures.

DEFAULTED PAYMENTS

Twenty-seven installments of interest and principal on outstanding loans remained unpaid on June 30, 1939, and were thereby defaulted. The borrowers, however, are being granted extensions of time to pay interest and principal in accordance with section 12 of the Rural Electrification Act which authorizes the Administrator to extend the time of payment of principal or interest of loans for power systems for a period not in excess of 5 years. The payments allowed to become past due were in situations where the old 20-year-payment plan was in effect with its accelerated scale of payment. None of these situations is a result of impaired assets or operating conditions which cannot be remedied. In many instances the difficulty lay in the fact that circumstances beyond the control of the borrower, such as injunctions by private interests, had delayed construction or energization and the inflow of operating revenue. Some of the systems affected have since shown an accelerated growth. The total of such defaulted payments was \$65,616.30.

On R. E. A.'s wiring and plumbing installation loan contracts, under which \$2,114,315 had been advanced up to December 1, 1939, collections showed less than 1 percent delinquencies. No extensions of time have been granted on any of these loans. Furthermore, full interest and principal payments begin 6 months after the date of the note.

Especially encouraging is the fact that a number of R. E. A. borrowers have made substantial payments well ahead of the dates on which they were to fall due, as shown by the following section of the Annual Report (p. 133):

ELEVEN BORROWERS PAY IN ADVANCE

Indeed, some of the earlier established systems have shown up so well in point of revenues, that 11 of the cooperatives and other borrowers have made—or, in one instance, is about to make—substantial payments of interest and principal in advance. The Green River Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation of Owensboro, Ky., recently paid \$6,000 to wipe out interest accumulated but not yet due and made an advance payment on principal of \$10,000.

Similarly, the Inter-County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation of Danville, Ky., has requested authority for payment of \$6,000 for interest charges not yet due, and of \$4,000 in advance on principal.

Eight other borrowers made interest and principal payments in advance, repaying obligations which will fall due on various dates in 1940 and 1941. These systems are: Illini Electric Cooperative, of Champaign, Ill.; the Jackson County Rural Electric Membership Corporation, of Brownstown, Ind.; the Amana Society Service Co., of Amana, Iowa; the Maquoketa Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, of Anamosa, Iowa; the Benton County Electric Cooperative Association, of Vinton, Iowa; the Salt River Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation, of Bardstown, Ky.; the Pitt & Greene Electric Membership Corporation, of Farmville, N. C.; and the Duck River Electric Membership Corporation, of Shelbyville, Tenn.

Another such borrower is the Anoka County Cooperative Light & Power Association, of Anoka, Minn., whose system did not go into operation until March 1938. In May 1939, little more than a year after it began serving its farmer members, it found itself with a substantial amount of cash in the bank from the excess of revenues over operating costs. The only payment falling due on its loan was one of about \$1,000 for interest on June 1. On its own motion, the cooperative paid to R. E. A. all interest which had accrued but would not become due for some time, amounting to approximately \$6,000.

A few weeks later a tornado hit the cooperative's system at the one spot where it could do the most damage; it utterly demolished the substation. The cooperative still had sufficient resources to restore service and complete repairs.

The total of the advance payments made or about to be made by the 11 borrowers mentioned is \$79,594.70.

I believe that most people will agree with me that those statements contain a good deal of specific information, and that the disclosures of defaulted payments reveal considerably more frankness than the Senator from Ohio has been willing to attribute to R. E. A. Furthermore, when I asked the Administrator whether he could bring those two figures, the figures on advance payments and on defaults, a little more up to date, he was good enough to provide me with figures for January 1, 1940. By that date advance payments of interest and principal made out of operating revenues amounted to \$140,643. I ask whether that is not an excellent showing, particularly when we remember, as the Senator from Nebraska pointed out in the debate a few days ago, that all rural electric enterprises, whether public, private, or cooperative, require a period of growth of perhaps 5 years before they attain their full development. Not one of the systems financed by R. E. A. has been energized for so long a time.

Installments in arrears on January 1, 1940, totaled \$56,765. In explanation of this figure, Mr. Slattery tells me that it represents current delinquencies; that is, payments now overdue according to the requirements of loan contracts now in effect. The reduction over the earlier figure is accounted for by rescheduling of the terms of payment, a subject to which I shall return later. Here I wish simply to point out that the early administration of R. E. A. set terms for the beginning of payment of interest and principal on a very rigorous basis. This was done with the intent of extension in particular instances according to particular circumstances, such as delays in construction and energization, and therefore the earning of income, beyond the control of a borrower.

From time to time we hear demands from various quarters that these new and still developing cooperative associations submit, for public inspection, detailed reports of their operations. Some of them have done so. Other cooperatives have been more cautious. R. E. A. has been cautious too, since it is a fair question just how far the agency should go in revealing detailed figures on the cooperatives it has financed. A banker would ordinarily consider it his duty to inform himself of operations in appraising the soundness of a loan; but he would certainly not consider it his privilege to disclose confidential business reports. R. E. A. is in much the same position. Moreover, when we trace the origin of some of these demands for information, that caution seems only the part of wisdom. Within the past 2 months an editorial demanding such reports was circulated widely in many States. Some cooperative officials, recognizing in its vituperative tone another hand than that of the local editor, took the trouble to find out the source of the editorial. Their investigations established that it was the work of the Hofer syndicate, of

Portland, Oreg., a so-called news service which, the Federal Trade Commission hearings several years ago disclosed, had collected \$84,820 a year from various utilities and a like amount from other industrial concerns. Of course, in sending out the editorial the Hofer firm did not inform local editors that it had ever received such subsidies.

I am told, too, that these cooperatives frequently receive questionnaires from other agencies which are closely associated with, or sponsored by, private utility interests. These questionnaires attempt to probe deeply into figures on such points as number of members connected, amount of energy purchased at wholesale and sold at retail, rates, revenues, and related items. Since the cooperatives are still in an early developmental stage, it is perfectly natural that their showing would be less favorable than it would be after they had been in operation for a reasonable period. Every figure is, therefore, a weapon to be turned against them, and I can, therefore, see very clearly, and I believe that every true friend of rural electrification can see, that the publication of these figures at this time might in certain instances have a very unfortunate effect on the R. E. A. cooperatives. Of course, the Congress, which has the responsibility for authorizing these loans, has the right and, indeed, the duty to satisfy itself as to their soundness and the outlook for their repayment. But we can—and should—do so without exposing these young cooperatives to the hostile attacks of those who would like to scuttle this program.

The Senator from Ohio asserted on the floor of the Senate last Thursday that the R. E. A. financed cooperatives "have not earned the interest" on their loans from the Government. This seemed without foundation, and I asked Mr. Slattery, the Administrator of R. E. A., to give me some figures on it. He has given me a statement which I should like to have inserted in the *RECORD* as a part of my remarks. It shows that of the energized systems financed by R. E. A., 280 had, by February 29, 1940, made payments of interest and principal out of operating revenues. With reference to these payments from revenues, I wish to call attention to one of the provisions of many of the loan contracts covering this R. E. A. financing. Under this provision payments are not required until 30 months after the loan contract is executed. This fact in substantial part accounts for the difference between the number of systems energized—579—and the number appearing in this table—280—as making payments out of revenues.

Of course, the deferring of payments for 30 months does not wholly account for the difference. Some of the R. E. A. financed cooperatives have very small revenues as yet, and have had to meet their early interest payments out of loan funds, as so many new enterprises do. Some few are in default, as I have pointed out. That fact, as I have already shown, was candidly revealed in the 1939 annual report. The report also reveals at least one very significant reason for many of these defaults. On the earlier loans, a 20-year maximum repayment period was provided for in the loan contracts, with payments of interest scheduled to begin long before anything approaching full development of the systems could possibly have taken place. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was drawn with a clear recognition of the need for a development period, and authorized the substitution of the 25-year maximum period of repayment. On a number of these loans, therefore, the extension has been granted, and where it appears desirable a rescheduling to the longer term is now in process for other loans. All revisions that have been made have been kept within the terms of the 25-year schedule, while on many other loans the 20-year terms have been retained, even though they appear generally less appropriate, simply because there has been no need, thus far at least, to change them.

The Senator from Ohio also remarked last Thursday that if we could produce evidence that a single rural electric cooperative has earned the interest on its indebtedness, he thought it should be inserted in the *RECORD*. After a brief

discussion of some figures I have obtained from R. E. A., I shall be happy to comply with his request.

Now about Tennessee. Naturally, I am most keenly interested in the progress of the R. E. A. financed cooperatives in my own State, which lies in the T. V. A. area. It is, of course, true that these cooperatives enjoy the benefit of the unusually low T. V. A. rates for wholesale power. But, let us remember that their retail rates are correspondingly low, and that, moreover, they are operating in rural areas where the average of farm income is low. I have looked into the financial condition of the projects in Tennessee and I find it very encouraging indeed. In December 1939 there were 13 projects in operation in my State, with 34,720 consumers actually taking service. The gross revenue of these 13 systems for that month was \$131,784. Their operating expenses, including the cost of purchased power, taxes, and depreciation, came to \$95,610. This leaves an earned net revenue of \$36,174 to cover current interest expenses of \$14,433, and means that for the group as a whole interest expenses were earned two and a third times. Up to December 31, 1939, these Tennessee projects had made, out of revenue, interest and principal payments to R. E. A. totaling \$84,339. Needless to say, some of them are doing better than others. One of them has made no such payments at all. On the other hand, a majority of them have made substantial payments from their operating revenues. The Southwest Tennessee Electric Cooperative, for example, had paid from revenues a total of \$21,609 up to December 13, 1939, while close behind came the Volunteer Electric Cooperative, with \$19,928. Or, looking at the question from another point of view, the Southwest Tennessee Electric Cooperative had an interest expense for December 1939 of \$1,447, while its net operating revenue, available to meet these interest requirements, was \$3,444, or two and one-third times as great. The Volunteer Cooperatives makes an even more favorable showing, with \$1,184 of interest expense and \$4,654, or four times the interest requirement, as net operating revenue. Certainly these figures do not lead me to conclude, as the Senator from Ohio has asserted, that it is doubtful that we shall ever get back more than one-half of what we actually advance to these R. E. A. projects. On the contrary, the figures seem to indicate that by and large these R. E. A. loans will be, as they are intended to be, self-liquidating.

In Tennessee we have a large rural population scattered among our 95 counties. Lines financed by R. E. A. are already energized in sections of 36 of Tennessee's counties, and are in progress in 16 others. I look forward to the time when farm families in every county in Tennessee will have the advantages of low-cost T. V. A. electricity through their own R. E. A. financed cooperatives. The number of Tennessee farms with central-station electric service has tripled since December 1934, and yet nearly 90 percent of Tennessee's 288,000 farms are without service. In the eastern half of the State the need for rural electrification is especially acute. There hundreds of thousands of hard-working, self-reliant men, women, and children on the upland farms are still chained to primitive hardship and toil. Their sinew and their backbone have toughened the sinew and backbone of America; yet America, in her progress, has until now largely passed them by. Electric power, in Tennessee as in every other State in the Union, can do much to bring our farm people abreast of modern life. It is our responsibility, through forwarding the R. E. A. program, to see that it does.

I am proud of the progress Tennessee has made in this field and hope the time may soon come when every county and every farm will have rural electrification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tables and other material presented in connection with this matter may be printed in the *RECORD* at this point, as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Statement for December 1939 of six Rural Electrification Administration financed projects in Tennessee

Name of borrower	Number of consumers	Residential average kilowatt-hour	Gross revenue	Operating expenses ¹	Net revenue ²	Current interest expense	Times interest earned	Interest and principal paid to Rural Electrification Administration from revenue to Dec. 31, 1939
Tenn. 1. Volunteer Electric Cooperative.....	3,374	84.2	\$14,909	\$10,255	\$4,654	\$1,184	3.93	\$19,928
Tenn. 16. Southwest Tennessee Electric Cooperative.....	2,674	115.7	11,673	8,229	3,444	1,447	2.38	21,609
Tenn. 19. Middle Tennessee Electric Cooperative.....	4,226	95.7	14,904	10,961	3,943	1,813	2.17	10,960
Tenn. 20. Gibson County Electric Cooperative.....	4,949	91.9	20,550	12,454	8,096	2,229	3.63	3,269
Tenn. 21. Duck River Electric Membership Cooperative.....	6,047	88.8	28,657	21,230	7,427	3,195	2.32	16,910
Tenn. 23. Town of Dickson.....	1,167	70.5	3,892	2,478	1,414	374	3.78	2,542
Total.....	22,437		94,585	65,607	28,978	10,242	2.83	75,218

¹ This item covers all operating costs including purchased power, taxes, and depreciation.² Available for interest and principal repayments.

Rural Electrification Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture—Report of payments made by borrowers from revenues as of Feb. 29, 1940

	Interest	Principal
ALABAMA		
9. Clarke Washington Electric Membership Corporation.....	\$1,804.53	
18. Cullman County Electric Membership Corporation.....	6,545.58	\$7,721.72
20. Baldwin County Electric Membership Corporation.....	3,632.23	2,211.82
21. Cherokee County Electric Membership Corporation.....	1,727.91	
23. South Alabama Electric Membership Corporation.....	9,332.01	1,364.67
ARIZONA		
2. Stonewall Electric Co.....	525.79	
4. San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District.....	5,137.29	15,859.94
ARKANSAS		
10. First Electric Cooperative Corporation.....	1,220.45	1,878.13
11. Farmers Electric Cooperative Corporation.....	819.21	
13. Arkansas Valley Electric Cooperative Corporation.....	482.31	
14. Arkansas Power & Light Co.....	12,871.45	5,000.00
15. Woodruff Electric Cooperative Corporation.....	910.74	
CALIFORNIA		
1. Imperial Irrigation District.....	25,495.66	
6. Surprise Valley Electrification Corporation.....	2,454.30	
COLORADO		
7. Grand Valley Rural Power Lines, Inc.....	2,880.99	
14. San Luis Valley Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	4,604.91	
15. Morgan County Rural Electric Association.....	1,745.31	
21. Stonewall Electric Co.....	268.02	
DELAWARE		
2. The Delaware Rural Electric Association.....	12,434.87	
FLORIDA		
7. Florida Power Corporation.....	13,189.71	30,302.65
12. Florida Public Service.....	1,783.43	6,381.60
GEORGIA		
2. The Crisp Farmers Cooperative Corporation.....	4,881.70	3,638.33
7. North Georgia Electric Membership Corporation.....	26,704.78	13,900.49
8. The Rayle Electric Membership Corporation.....	807.15	124.42
16. Georgia Power & Light Co.....	7,944.96	20,115.76
17. The Planters Electric Membership Corporation.....	4,811.23	
20. Troup County Electric Membership Corporation.....	5,737.58	11.12
22. The Colquitt County Rural Electric Co.....	16,684.30	
31. Upson County Electric Membership Corporation.....	2,156.79	
34. The Carroll Electric Membership Corporation.....	5,376.42	8,337.85
35. The Walton Electrical Association.....	5,268.84	6,342.33
37. Douglas County Electric Membership Corporation.....	4,395.25	5,868.94
42. The Altamaha Electric Membership Corporation.....	6,413.80	4,263.31
51. Snapping Shoals Power & Light Co.....	4,448.90	3,695.38
58. The Central Georgia Electric Membership Corporation.....	5,487.58	765.30
65. Irwin County Electric Membership Corporation.....	8,202.22	5,969.50
66. Taylor County Electric Membership Corporation.....	3,976.30	566.35
67. The Satilla Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	3,196.26	4,705.45
IDAHO		
4. 6. North Idaho Rural Electric Rehabilitation Association, Inc.....	11,475.28	468.07
10. Clearwater Valley Light & Power Association, Inc.....	1,135.12	1,822.44
ILLINOIS		
2. Wayne-White Counties Electric Cooperative.....	6,894.99	
4. Suburban Electric Corporation.....	4,977.62	76,948.21

LXXXVI—238

Rural Electrification Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture—Report of payments made by borrowers from revenues as of Feb. 29, 1940—Continued

	Interest	Principal
ILLINOIS—continued		
7. Farmers Mutual Electric Co.....	\$3,430.41	\$2,473.52
18. Illinois Rural Electric Co.....	7,133.33	
21. Menard Electric Cooperative.....	7,481.42	10,984.35
23. Rural Electric Convenience Cooperative Co.....	13,850.49	14,832.50
26. Eastern Illinois Power Cooperative.....	15,076.25	3,885.61
28. Illinois Electric Cooperative.....	2,796.11	
INDIANA		
1. Utilities District of Western Indiana Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	1,441.71	2,328.24
6. Boone County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	35,408.24	39,502.60
7. Whitley County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	19,347.57	24,456.07
8. Wabash County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	7,247.82	11,438.68
9. Marshall County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	1,252.83	2,022.82
14. Shelby County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	28,927.64	
16. Henry County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	24,637.19	11,116.92
18. Rush County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	7,026.61	635.69
21. Bartholomew County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	4,017.34	
24. Carroll County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	9,439.98	14,855.98
32. Hancock County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	8,425.75	2,184.14
33. Hendricks County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	18,575.54	16,388.65
38. Johnson County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	13,892.50	4,019.25
50. Wayne County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	531.45	814.62
74. Huntington County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	14,881.55	24,638.72
80. Noble County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	531.96	845.00
92. Jackson County Rural Electric Membership Corporation.....	8,938.35	
101. Central Indiana Power Co.....	3,942.66	
IOWA		
5. Glidden Rural Electric Cooperative.....	1,167.42	
6. Central Iowa Power Co.....	543.60	1,604.89
9. Eastern Iowa Light & Power Cooperative.....	14,527.03	22,971.73
11. Gowrie Rural Electric Cooperative Association.....	1,473.70	1,417.17
12. Amana Society Service Co.....	2,370.21	5,410.46
14. Humboldt County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	2,546.39	
15. Harrison County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	1,747.66	
16. Monona County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	7,051.20	
18. Boone Valley Electric Cooperative.....	3,458.18	3,271.19
19. Adams County Cooperative Electric Co.....	2,151.95	1,096.76
23. The South Crawford Rural Electric Cooperative.....	2,376.67	
26. Shelby County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	5,301.30	
27. Buena Vista County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	2,745.55	1,535.71
30. Franklin Rural Electric Cooperative.....	10,044.85	
31. Grundy County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	3,151.01	3,972.29
32. Butler County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	709.48	1,109.16
33. The Calhoun County Electric Cooperative Association.....	9,187.26	
34. Maquoketa Valley Rural Electric Cooperative.....	5,204.76	3,508.60
36. Wright County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	5,071.72	5,639.56
38. Pocahontas County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	2,142.60	1,038.01
39. Benton County Electric Cooperative Association.....	15,162.21	2,036.95
40. Pella Cooperative Electric Association.....	3,053.67	
43. Greene County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	688.77	1,112.02
45. City of Maquoketa.....	3,089.70	
47. Federated Cooperative Power Association.....	1,634.87	7,235.49
48. Central Electric Federated Cooperative Association.....	1,703.70	2,745.44
49. Hardin County Rural Electric Cooperative.....	3,259.36	1,126.17

Rural Electrification Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture—Report of payments made by borrowers from revenues as of Feb. 29, 1940—Continued

	Interest	Principal
KANSAS		
3. The Utility Service Co.	\$80.71	\$129.58
7. The Jewell-Mitchell Cooperative Electric Co., Inc.	3,979.80	
13. The Brown-Atchison Electric Cooperative Association, Inc.	3,178.26	378.81
15. The D. S. & O. Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc.	609.46	978.49
KENTUCKY		
1. Kentucky Rural Electrification Co.	3,684.53	3,442.33
14. Henderson County Rural Electrification Association	5,856.96	416.41
18. Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	636.73	1,024.84
20. Jackson Purchase Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	678.20	1,092.14
21. Salt River Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	17,394.26	3,437.16
23. Taylor County Rural Electric Cooperative	698.92	
27. Inter-County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	6,497.15	
30. Shelby Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	481.60	770.16
33. Green River Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	13,439.27	10,667.85
37. Owen County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	630.05	1,014.45
52. Fleming-Mason Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	1,327.97	1,656.66
MARYLAND		
4. Southern Maryland Tri-County Cooperative Association	5,696.15	1,224.41
MICHIGAN		
5. Southeastern Michigan Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1,202.75	
28. Presque Isle County Electric Cooperative Association	1,437.62	2,255.14
37. Thumb Electric Cooperative of Michigan	13,136.45	
38. Fruit Belt Electric Cooperative	603.58	971.94
MINNESOTA		
1. P. I. C. K. Cooperative Electric Association	3,801.79	6,052.07
3. Meeker Cooperative Light & Power Association	1,976.90	13,583.10
4. The Cooperative Light & Power Association of Lake County	6,868.66	
9. Goodhue County Cooperative Electric Association	8,630.18	13,532.90
10. Carlton County Cooperative Power Association	3,600.22	2,696.84
15. Wells Electric Association	3,964.69	3,066.67
18. Douglas County Cooperative Light & Power Association	9,205.07	3,959.16
25. McLeod Cooperative Power Association	26,565.25	16,718.58
32. Tri-County Electric Cooperative	4,537.32	1,834.38
35. Brown County Rural Electric Association	8,506.96	5,460.66
37. Federated Rural Electric Association	7,758.09	11,303.07
48. Anoka County Cooperative Light & Power Association	3,508.54	5,836.56
53. Steele Vaseco Cooperative Electric	13,935.24	1,625.15
54. Faribault County Cooperative Electric Association	3,501.30	5,339.96
55. South Central Electric Association	7,142.14	6,796.90
56. Crow Wing Cooperative Power & Light Co.	1,116.06	
60. Central Minnesota Cooperative Power Association of Redwood County	774.83	1,198.77
61. Freeborn-Mower Cooperative Light & Power Association	6,913.17	7,693.36
62. Wright-Hennepin Cooperative Electric Association	1,101.26	1,676.13
63. The Minnesota Valley Electric Cooperative	2,752.57	4,199.58
65. The Dakota County Electric Cooperative	1,411.75	3,042.47
66. Nobles Cooperative Electric	8,592.03	7,836.66
81. Mille Lac Region Cooperative Power & Light Association	3,857.20	2,926.33
MISSISSIPPI		
1. The Monroe County Electric Power Association	8,433.77	9,000.00
19. The City of Holly Springs	3,406.40	1,000.00
20. Yazoo Valley Electric Power Association	6,077.22	
21. Coahoma Electric Power Association	2,154.99	4,143.84
22. Central Electric Power Association	779.73	1,257.07
23. Southwest Mississippi Electric Power Association	490.68	787.89
24. North East Mississippi Electric Power Association	721.55	1,165.24
28. Coast Electric Power Association	419.17	674.80
29. Four-County Electric Power Association	605.95	
50. Natchez Trace Electric Power Association	776.53	
MISSOURI		
18. Intercounty Electric Cooperative Association	2,900.21	1,576.45
19. Boone County Cooperative Electric Association	845.71	1,367.37
20. Missouri Rural Electric Cooperative Association	16,753.10	
22. Howard County Electric Cooperative Association	882.33	
23. Lewis County Rural Electric Cooperative Association	3,811.03	
24. Callaway County Electrical Cooperative Association	1,452.28	
26. Ralls County Electric Cooperative Association	2,235.15	
27. Northwest Missouri Electric Cooperative	2,343.72	
25. Missouri General Utilities Co.	2,804.52	4,945.56

Rural Electrification Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture—Report of payments made by borrowers from revenues as of Feb. 29, 1940—Continued

	Interest	Principal
MONTANA		
1. Ravalli County Electric Cooperative, Inc.	\$5,050.51	\$1,415.82
2. Sun River Electric Cooperative, Inc.	725.58	1,166.82
5. Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association	735.33	1,186.65
9. Yellowstone Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1,900.88	1,690.45
10. Vigilante Electric Cooperative, Inc.	362.69	584.70
11. Sanders Electric Cooperative, Inc.	828.50	
12. Missoula Electric Cooperative Inc.	528.73	852.41
NEBRASKA		
1. Roosevelt Rural Public Power District	1,357.05	
2. Gering Valley Rural Public Power District	3,534.16	
3. Chimney Rock Public Power District	564.49	906.62
5. Southern Nebraska Rural Public Power District	932.55	
7. Southeastern Nebraska Rural Public Power District	29,709.12	20,490.55
24. Lancaster County Rural Public Power District	12,666.99	
44. Eastern Nebraska Rural Public Power District	24,298.80	694.26
51. Burt County Rural Public Power District	9,314.45	1,023.09
54. Cumming County Rural Public Power District	1,187.12	
NEW JERSEY		
4. Tri-County Rural Electric Co., Inc.	3,591.38	837.96
6. Sussex Rural Electric Cooperative	4,740.22	1,963.17
NEW YORK		
18. New York State Gas & Electric Corporation	16,385.31	12,820.52
NORTH CAROLINA		
3. Wilson County Electric Membership Corporation	9,066.92	9,638.01
9. Tide Water Power Co.	9,019.76	18,717.10
14. Pitt & Greene Electric Membership Corporation	1,565.39	
15. Johnston County Electric Membership Corporation	226.94	8,000.00
16. Edgecombe Martin County Electric Membership Corporation	1,778.09	2,037.91
23. Caldwell Mutual Corporation	10,027.43	8,315.03
25. Rutherford Rural Electric Mutual Association, Inc.	150.56	241.73
27. Ocracoke Power & Light Co.	658.39	3,098.00
29. Pamlico Ice & Light Co.	545.89	
41. City of Greenville	190.60	
NORTH DAKOTA		
8. Baker Electric Cooperative, Inc.	415.50	729.60
11. Cass County Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1,986.64	3,321.26
OHIO		
1. Pioneer Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	36,259.80	
24. Delaware Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	6,127.49	9,740.24
29. Inter-County Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	4,803.12	
30A. Marion Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	6,310.44	846.49
31. Holmes Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	29,339.35	11,010.02
33. Midwest Electric, Inc.	3,737.01	5,917.77
41. Licking-Rural Electrification, Inc.	1,078.56	1,659.64
42. Darke Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1,966.14	
50. Union Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	8,828.39	
55. Tuscarawas-Coshocton Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1,350.92	1,955.24
56. Lorain-Medina Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	30,220.62	9,793.34
59. Morrow Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	2,251.84	3,618.11
60. North Central Electric Cooperative, Inc.	1,618.92	2,852.88
65. South Central Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	767.06	1,234.48
68A. Logan County Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	396.77	
71. Logan County Cooperative, Power & Light Association, Inc.	7,278.93	793.43
74. Butler Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.	4,327.39	
75. North Western Electric Cooperative, Inc.	3,012.01	
OKLAHOMA		
1. Cimarron Electric Cooperative	2,796.44	4,226.63
2. Kay City Electric Cooperative	3,647.94	3,370.44
6. Caddo Electric Cooperative	1,272.01	1,970.75
8. Earl W. Baker Utilities Co.	4,463.36	9,605.35
10. Oklahoma Electric Cooperative	1,859.35	2,996.88
12. Alfalfa Electric Cooperative, Inc.	4,443.69	2,300.39
14. Red River Valley Rural Electric Association	889.17	
OREGON		
2. 2G. Blachly-Lane County Cooperative Electric Association	783.03	
5. Nehalem Valley Cooperative Electric Association	1,193.63	
14. Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association	312.07	
PENNSYLVANIA		
4. Northwestern Rural Electric Cooperative Association	15,638.57	
6. Southwest Central Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation	3,814.86	6,213.81
12. Sullivan County Rural Electric Cooperative Inc.	2,146.58	
13. Tri-County Rural Electric Cooperative Association	10,744.00	14,127.85
14. The Central Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Inc.	7,017.07	11,069.79
15. Claverack Electric Cooperative, Inc.	6,217.41	9,124.46

Rural Electrification Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture—Report of payments made by borrowers from revenues as of Feb. 29, 1940—Continued

	Interest	Principal
SOUTH CAROLINA		
1. 9. State Rural Electrification Authority.....	\$30,226.84	\$61,035.64
13. Greenwood City, S. C.....	9,441.48	7,000.00
SOUTH DAKOTA		
3. Clay-Union Electric Corporation.....	1,201.58	1,565.77
6. Union County Rural Power Co.....	704.83	1,132.51
7. Lincoln Union Electric Co.....	1,098.27	
TENNESSEE		
1. Volunteer Electric Cooperative.....	12,370.67	5,361.86
9. Tri-County Electric Membership Corporation.....	2,805.02	900.21
16. Southwest Tennessee Electric Membership Corporation.....	13,072.22	12,313.92
19. Middle Tennessee Electric Membership Corporation.....	16,270.11	273.12
20. Gibson County Electric Membership Corporation.....	1,998.63	2,904.58
21. Duck River Electric Membership Corporation.....	16,775.49	
22. Mayor and Alderman of Milan, Tenn.....	1,810.83	
23. Town of Dickson.....	2,542.19	
24. Cumberland Electric Membership Corporation.....	1,723.39	
25. Upper Cumberland Electric Membership Corporation.....	3,947.73	
31. Pickwick Electric Membership Corporation.....	3,768.58	
32. Meriwether Lewis Electric Cooperative.....	2,743.61	
TEXAS		
7. Bartlett Community Light & Power Co.....	3,927.51	5,610.06
21. Belfalls Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	18,006.86	
33. City of Bryan, Tex.....	12,140.83	
33. Hill County Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	2,154.95	3,478.11
39. Farmers Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	1,021.11	
41. Panola-Harrison Power Co.....	4,646.12	3,172.89
44. Hunt-Collin Electric Cooperative.....	1,057.37	1,698.92
45. Limestone County Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	1,762.30	2,825.30
46. Farmers Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	8,414.24	
47. Deaf Smith County Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	935.16	
49. Denton County Electric Cooperative, Inc.....	3,257.38	5,226.62
9074. City of Seymour.....	1,740.96	
VIRGINIA		
2. Craig-Botetourt Electric Cooperative.....	4,505.20	7,091.31
11. Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative.....	12,920.54	18,746.60
18. Tidewater Electric Service Co.....	3,755.83	17,203.75
20. The Bull Run Power Co.....	4,365.59	4,674.77
22. Virginia Electric Cooperative.....	22,127.79	23,430.03
27. Southside Electric Co.....	2,737.37	4,527.50
WASHINGTON		
8. Benton Rural Electric Association.....	216.88	
9. Orcas Power & Light Co.....	210.22	337.50
18. Inland Empire Rural Electrification, Inc.....	3,293.77	5,309.47
WEST VIRGINIA		
10. Harrison Rural Electrification Association, Inc.....	501.95	
WISCONSIN		
14. Oconto Electric Cooperative.....	10,621.05	
16. Head of Lakes Cooperative Electric Association.....	6,738.06	4,851.55
19. Chippewa Valley Electric Cooperative.....	1,240.19	1,705.52
21. Taylor County Electric Cooperative.....	3,002.12	
25. Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association.....	4,548.68	3,507.39
27. Buffalo Electric Cooperative.....	3,747.97	
29. Clark Electric Cooperative.....	10,551.22	9,804.02
31. Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative.....	15,879.79	897.00
32. Pierce-Pepin Electric Cooperative.....	7,188.32	10,502.81
35. Richland Cooperative Electric Association.....	13,079.70	18,197.12
37. Trempealeau Electric Cooperative.....	13,300.18	18,453.52
38. Rock County Electric Cooperative Association.....	18,827.42	4,618.48
40. Barron County Electric Cooperative.....	5,385.12	
41. Vernon Electric Cooperative.....	9,788.64	15,753.60
45. Wisconsin Power Cooperative.....	366.65	588.65
WYOMING		
5. Big Horn Rural Electric Co.....	935.56	636.06
6. Wyoylee Co.....	1,313.81	1,973.75
10. Wheatland Rural Electric Association.....	2,064.43	717.61
11. Lower Valley Power & Light, Inc.....	1,007.84	1,605.98
12. Garland Light & Power Co.....	1,239.76	370.99
13. Washakie Rural Electric Co.....	361.09	582.87
Total.....	1,638,519.93	1,168,483.95

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HERRING in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

He also, from the same committee, reported adversely the nomination of James Earl Evans to be postmaster at Carrollton, Mo., in place of Lee Dickson.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of William M. Lindsay, of Kansas, to be United States marshal for the district of Kansas, vice Lon Warner, removed.

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW F. MCGUIRE—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, I submit a favorable report upon the nomination of Matthew F. McGuire, of Massachusetts, to be the Assistant to the Attorney General, vice Edward G. Kemp, resigned.

Mr. President, I may say that Mr. McGuire was appointed to the Department of Justice in 1934 as a special attorney in the Criminal Division, and has steadily advanced through the various degrees in the Department until he has now been nominated for the second place in the Department.

He has the rather unusual distinction nowadays of having been a school teacher, a newspaperman, and a most successful lawyer. He was graduated from Holy Cross College with a bachelor of arts degree in 1921. Thereafter he studied law at Boston University, from which he was graduated in 1926. In the meantime, in 1923, he established a weekly newspaper at Charlestown, Mass., in the shadow of Bunker Hill. While still a newspaperman, having already taught school in Boston for a year, he entered upon the practice of law in the city of Boston, where he was associated with the present Attorney General of Massachusetts, Mr. Paul Dever.

He has had a notable career. In the Department of Justice as a special attorney he aided materially in the drafting of the law, popularly known as the Lindbergh kidnapping law. His knowledge and experience were also called upon in the writing of other Federal crime laws, which were enacted a few years ago for the purpose of eliminating gangsterism.

This was followed by his promotion to be an associate of the Assistant to the Attorney General. In that capacity he supervised personnel, and, upon the resignation of Joseph B. Keenan, Mr. McGuire acted as the Assistant Attorney General. A year ago he was named to a newly created post of Special Assistant Attorney General, and in that capacity acted as liaison officer between the Attorney General and Congress and other agencies and departments of the Government. He also handled confidential, special legal, and administrative matters. The duties of the latter office will be combined with the duties of his new important post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the first nomination on the calendar, that of Dorothy B. Keeling to be postmaster at Camp Taylor, Ky., which I ask go over under the previous request made by the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters on the calendar will be confirmed en bloc, with the exception of the first nomination, which will be passed over.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF DOROTHY B. KEELING

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my attention was directed to another matter for a moment. I wish to refer to the first nomination on the calendar. For several days the nomination of Dorothy B. Keeling to be postmaster at Camp Taylor, Ky., has gone over at my request, because I had received some communications asking that it be held up. I have indicated to those who protested that if there was anything they could present concerning the qualifications or character of this lady I would submit it to the Senate. But nothing of that sort has been brought to my attention. It is rather a contest between applicants for this appointment, and I have no desire to hold it up any longer. I ask that the nomination of Dorothy B. Keeling to be postmaster at Camp Taylor, Ky., be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 4), 1940

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. Edward James Stackpole, Jr., Pennsylvania National Guard, to be major general, National Guard of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Col. Alexander A. Vandegrift to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1940.

The following-named colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps, to correct the dates from which they take rank, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Alphonse DeCarre from the 1st day of September 1938.

Samuel L. Howard from the 5th day of September 1938.

Lyle H. Miller from the 1st day of October 1938.

Ralph J. Mitchell from the 3d day of January 1939.

Archie F. Howard from the 1st day of February 1939.

Raymond R. Wright from the 1st day of April 1939.

Pedro A. del Valle from the 1st day of April 1939.

William G. Hawthorne from the 1st day of June 1939.

Lt. Col. Thomas E. Watson to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1939.

Lt. Col. William C. James to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 21st day of August 1939.

Lt. Col. Thomas E. Bourke to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of November 1939.

Lt. Col. LeRoy P. Hunt to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of January 1940.

Lt. Col. Clifton B. Cates to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1940.

Lt. Col. Leo D. Hermle to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1940.

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of April 1940:

Herman R. Anderson

Julian P. Brown

Merritt A. Edson

Pay Clerk Norman C. Bates to be a chief pay clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 18th day of December 1939.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1 (legislative day of March 4), 1940

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Albert C. Santi, Ivoryton.

Frederick J. Bielefield, Middletown.

Patrick J. Goode, New Haven.

KENTUCKY

Dorothy B. Keeling, Camp Taylor.

LOUISIANA

Mrs. Leonard C. Davenport, Mer Rouge.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ruth N. Ray, Chester.

Leon A. Warren, Groveton.

Arlene S. R. Wells, Haverhill.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph P. Duffy, Bristol.

Allen J. Stevens, Carlisle.

Vesta Alice Swartz, Dauphin.

James F. Donahue, Kennett Square.

George L. Corrigan, New Hope.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee that Thou hast made Thyself known to us through Jesus Christ our Lord. Through Him we have words for our tongues, thoughts for our minds, and light for our eyes; oh, be Thou unto us a Saviour. Take from our hearts our burdens as we help others to lift theirs. Keep us from being narrow and willful, that our daily desire may be to walk with Thee in new strength, new beauty, and in new joy. Heavenly Father, if faith is the victory that overcometh the world, arm us with its power; if it be better to minister than to be ministered unto, teach us that the lowliest duty done is the highest service unto Thee; if love is better than hate and will help us bear all things, endure all things, and will last when prophecies fail and tongues cleave the dust, O God, wing our words that they may reach the hidden depths of many a heart. Scatter every cloud of doubt, that we may gather from the fields of abounding faith the living sheaves that are to be written in the Lamb's Book of Life. In the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 29, 1940, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. FRAZIER, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1940

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8641) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, to provide supplemental appropriations for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, insist on the House disagreement to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR, WOODRUM of Virginia, CANNON of Missouri, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles the money for the W. P. A. to bring in a resolution appropriating sufficient money to keep 2,100,000 people on the W. P. A. rolls during May and June. This morning I had a conference with Col. F. C. Harrington, Administrator of the W. P. A., who stated that while they had reduced their rolls for the month of April 200,000 below the number carried during March, he had not made any announcement as to what might happen during May and June. Colonel Harrington stated that during the month of March 2,300,000 people were on the W. P. A. rolls and that the money allocated to the various States for the month of April would only take care of 2,100,000 and that they started to work on that basis today.

Colonel Harrington further advised me if the W. P. A. rolls are to carry 2,100,000 during May and June, about \$38,000,000 additional will be needed by the W. P. A. This was in response to my inquiry. I also find that there are 1,000,000 people in the United States who, after an investigation, have been certified as being eligible for employment on W. P. A. who cannot be taken care of due to a lack of funds. These people are out of employment, have dependents, and naturally must look to the cities and States for assistance. I further learned that the W. P. A. has only been able to put back to work two-thirds of the number who were furloughed as a result of the 18-month clause in the existing law, that the balance, one-third, have been certified, all have dependents, but cannot be taken care of unless additional money is secured. It is my understanding that vacancies are not being filled as W. P. A. workers resign to accept private employment, but the number resigning is not sufficient to absorb the entire reduction that is necessary.

I am in favor of reducing expenditures where it is possible but not at the expense of men and women who have dependents who cannot secure work in private industry. A critical situation confronts the country, and I cannot see how the Congress is going to be able to refuse to appropriate additional money for W. P. A., not only between now and June 30, but for the next fiscal year. Business will certainly feel this reduction as the purchasing power of the people is being reduced. The cities and States say they will be unable to carry any additional load. I know in my State and city money available for direct relief will not enable St. Louis and the State of Missouri to take care of those who will be necessarily furloughed from W. P. A. if additional money is not made available.

Colonel Harrington will appear before the Appropriations Committee Tuesday and make a detailed statement in reference to the situation and I hope the committee will act immediately on a deficiency appropriation. [Applause.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in asking for this 1 minute was to reemphasize many of the things the gentleman from Missouri has said and to add just one more statement. The time for a reduction in Government employment of the unemployed is when private employment is increasing. That time is not now. It would require

\$86,800,000 to prevent any cuts in the W. P. A. rolls for the balance of this fiscal year. As a means of making this proposition definite, I am today introducing a deficiency appropriation bill to provide that amount of money for W. P. A. employment between now and the 1st of July.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I have placed on the Clerk's desk this morning a motion to discharge a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7240, which was introduced by me last year following the consideration of the relief bill by the House. This bill does the same thing the House did when it placed in the relief bill a provision that heads of families aged 45 and over should not be subjected to the automatic lay-off under the 18-month employment clause.

HOUSE ACTION RECALLED

If the Members of the House will recall, when the emergency relief appropriation bill of 1939 was before them, an amendment, which I sponsored and which is recorded on page 7363 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 16, 1939, was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole by teller vote and remained in the bill as passed by the House. However, the provision was later stricken in conference.

The amendment provided for the exemption of heads of families, 45 years of age and over, from the automatic separation from the Work Projects Administration at the end of an 18-month period of employment.

My astonishment at the action of the conferees was properly expressed when the conference report was presented to the House on June 30, and my remarks at that time were as follows:

An exemption to the automatic 60-day lay-off for heads of families—men and women—45 years and over with dependents was my amendment passed in the House by a teller vote; and now to realize that that humanitarian provision has been eliminated by the conferees comes as a distinct surprise to the membership of this body. In my opinion, the W. P. A., by the very nature of its set-up, should be a secure place for those in need of its humanitarian provisions, especially those of the age referred to and heads of families. Everyone knows a man or woman with dependents can save nothing on W. P. A. wages. The dread of the automatic lay-off period will prove a continuous worry throughout the period of employment. Perhaps legislation to correct this injustice is the answer.

Time has demonstrated the truth of my prediction. You will note that my remarks were concluded with the statement, "Perhaps legislation to correct this injustice is the answer."

CORRECTIVE MEASURE PROPOSED

Accordingly, on July 14, I introduced in the House, H. R. 7240, a bill to exempt certain persons with dependents from the provisions requiring separation from the Work Projects Administration rolls at the end of 18 months, which bill has been referred to the Appropriations Committee. In substance it champions the rights of heads of families, 45 and over, and seeks the same results as my amendment to which I have just referred.

Although it was manifestly the will of this House to include this exemption in the original bill, to date no action has been taken by the committee. Therefore, I am asking the Members of Congress to sign a petition which was placed on the Journal clerk's desk this morning. This is a motion to discharge the committee from consideration of H. R. 7240 and will bring this measure to the floor. As I stated, this matter has already been discussed and adopted, but in view of later evidence and obvious need for such corrective legislation, I suggest that we once more study the subject.

SURVEY PROVES INHUMANITY OF AUTOMATIC LAY-OFF

In July and August more than 775,000 W. P. A. project workers were dropped from their jobs in accordance with the 18-month provision of 1939 Relief Act. In November, 2 to 3 months after their dismissal, a survey was made covering 138,000 of these workers in 23 large and representative cities.

The facts of this survey, which was conducted by the Research Division of the Work Projects Administration, were set forth in a report by Col. F. C. Harrington, Commissioner of the Work Projects Administration, to the gentleman from Virginia, Representative CLIFTON R. WOODRUM, of the House Appropriations Committee, on January 26, 1940. The facts set forth in this survey are such as to prove the correctness of the decision of the House when they wrote the provision protecting from dismissal from the service, heads of families, 45 and over. What does the survey show as to W. P. A. workers dismissed under the 18-month rule, known as the dismissal clause? In spite of the fact that the dismissals occurred during a period of sharply rising industrial activities, less than 13 out of every 100 were found to have jobs as much as 3 months after the lay-off. Approximately half of these having jobs were earning less than the security wage they previously had earned on the W. P. A.

Colonel Harrington explained that the number finding jobs was no greater proportionately to those who would have left the rolls of their own accord, since voluntary separations have averaged over 100,000 a month during the last calendar year. The majority of these leave the W. P. A. to take jobs in private employment.

The survey also brought out that as late as November, of the 87 out of each 100 who did not have jobs, 28 were on local relief rolls, 27 have been reassigned to the W. P. A. and 32 were without public support of any kind, save what they could procure through surplus commodities. More than three-fourths of those who had not returned to the W. P. A. in November were subsisting on incomes below their previous earnings as project workers. In none of the 23 cities surveyed was the average income of this group—including wages of those privately employed, relief grants, and the value of food, fuel, and clothing distribution—as much as \$14 a week. In 10 of the 23 cities it was less than \$5. More than 100,000 of all those dismissed had no income whatever in the 2 weeks preceding the survey. Dismissals in accordance with the provision between July 1 and August 31 totaled nearly one-third of the total number employed as of July 1.

The study indicates that the average weekly earnings of those who had jobs when interviewed in November was \$17.22, while 21.2 percent received less than \$10 per week. The most critical conditions were experienced by those workers—nearly one-third of all those dismissed—who did not have private jobs when interviewed in November, who were not returned to the W. P. A., and for whom no direct relief was available. Forty percent of this group reported no income whatever during a period of 2 weeks before they were interviewed.

In summary, the results of this survey, which was made 2 to 3 months after the dismissal of these 775,000 W. P. A. workers, are set forth below:

CHART A

Status	Number of individuals	Percentage of total
Private jobs	94,225	12.7
Without jobs (no private, Work Projects Administration, nor direct relief)	249,550	32.2
On relief	220,100	28.4
Reassigned to Work Projects Administration	211,125	26.7

CHART B

Total weekly family income of workers separated in accordance with the 18-month provision who were not reassigned and who were not receiving direct relief

Weekly income: ¹	Percentage
No income	29.5
\$0.01-\$4.99	19.2
\$5-\$9.99	13.4
\$10-\$14.99	11.2
\$15-\$19.99	10.3
\$20-\$24.99	6.7
\$25 or over	9.7

100.0

¹Average income, \$5.50 per week.

CHART C

Total weekly family income of workers separated in accordance with the 18-month provision who were not reassigned to W. P. A.

Income: ¹	Percentage
No income	17.7
\$0.01-\$4.99	18.3
\$5-\$9.99	21.7
\$10-\$14.99	17.2
\$15-\$19.99	11.6
\$20-\$24.99	6.3
\$25 or more	7.2
Income compared with former W. P. A. wages:	
Higher	20.5
Same	2.3
Lower	77.2

¹Average income, \$8.23 per week.

This break-down of the facts is a compliment to the decision of the House of Representatives, but a sad commentary on the action of the conferees in permitting this humanitarian amendment to be stricken from the bill.

THE HOUSE WILL HAVE ITS WAY

I know the temper of this House. I feel I know their interest in the fathers and mothers, heads of families, forced to rely on the W. P. A. Therefore I know that it will come as a shock to all of you when you realize that 37 percent of the thousands of these workers who were dismissed were 45 years of age or older. These are the persons who have fought a losing battle and who have come to a point where they are no longer wanted by private industry. But because of the clause in the relief act were forced out of the ranks of the W. P. A. in spite of the fact that they have dependents looking to them for the necessities of life.

As I have said, the House tried to protect this large group who are heads of families, but because of the action of the conference the wishes of the Members were disregarded. It was stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that he could not see the "inhumanity" in the 18-month dismissal clause; in fact, he considered that it was "eminently proper and fair." But now, in view of the facts which have been made known to us by the Work Projects Administration survey, we know that it has been anything but humanitarian in its results.

When we realize that 37 percent of the persons dismissed under the clause are 45 years of age or older, then we can understand the terrific hardships which have resulted from the conference action in eliminating the exemption of these people from the harsh dismissal clause.

PLEA TO SIGN DISCHARGE PETITION NO. 27

In conclusion, I make a plea to each of you as individuals and to all of you as Members of the House of Representatives to sign discharge petition No. 27 in order that we may rectify the errors of the past. Not a person can doubt my sincerity, and I was never more sincere than I am this morning. This injustice to the heads of families 45 years of age and over should be corrected. It is the duty of this House, and there is no more powerful manner in which to present the will of this House to the Subcommittee on Appropriations having this matter under consideration than to sign this discharge petition No. 27. I ask your cooperation.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two letters to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE CENSUS

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in view of the hullabaloo raised by some of the Members of the House and of the Senate concerning a few of the questions on the schedules for the Sixteenth Census, I believe it is well to realize this hullabaloo is not universal throughout the Nation. Objections, based on claims that the census questions violate constitutional rights, and dire forebodings that they threaten the integrity of our American democracy and even the Republic itself, do not appear to be shared by the citizens of the First Congressional District of Colorado. The intelligent and ever-alert people of Denver are always most jealous of their liberties. I am happy to say they are never hesitant about protesting vigorously to their Representative when they believe their rights are threatened. But I have not received from them any protests whatsoever concerning the census questions.

Probably the people of Denver realize that the confidential nature of their answers to the census questions will be guarded as inviolate. Doubtless also they have in mind that all enumerators and other census officials have been solemnly admonished to guard jealously the confidential nature of these communications, and that, by act of Congress, violation of such admonition is subject to heavy penalties.

The opinion of an eminent educator of Colorado, Mr. Robert G. Dunbar, assistant professor of history at the Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Fort Collins, Colo., is also significant. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD, a letter from him to me on this subject. Mr. Dunbar points out the statistical value of the information sought and that "similar questions have been asked in previous censuses—the seventh, eighth, and ninth—without serious consequences to the Bill of Rights and American democracy"; and that "the American farmer has answered questions of this nature for decades."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND
MECHANIC ARTS AND EXPERIMENT STATION,
Fort Collins, Colo., March 13, 1940.

LAWRENCE LEWIS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The newspapers report the attempt that is being made by some Members of Congress to delete from the Sixteenth Census the schedule concerning wages and salaries.

It would be unfortunate if such a deletion took place. It is true that the census could be taken without the schedule, as it has been before, but the addition of the information on the national income will make it much more valuable. No other information will give as good an index of the economic and social conditions of the Nation at the end of the critical fourth decade of the twentieth century; no other schedule will be more valuable to American legislators, sociologists, economists, and social historians. Similar questions have been asked in previous censuses (the seventh, eighth, and ninth) without serious consequences to the Bill of Rights and American democracy; in truth, the American farmer has answered questions of this nature for decades.

I therefore urge that you do everything possible to keep the schedule on wages and salaries within the Sixteenth Census.

Yours truly,

ROBERT G. DUNBAR,
Assistant Professor of History.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago the 6th of this month, this Nation made a declaration of war. One year before that date the people little thought that would be the course of affairs.

The world is now once again engaged in mortal conflict, and we have thus far escaped participation in it.

Our citizens are anxiously watching every act of the Nation's men in public life. The slightest rumor of approach to the brink of war causes them grave concern.

A recent speech of one of our foreign representatives has not added to our people's peace of mind.

White books, issued by foreign governments, even though we know them to be mere war propaganda, sends the whole Nation into a state of jitters.

It seems to me that now is the time for national leaders in all departments of the Government to reassure our people that it is our determination to remain at peace. As 23 years ago we declared war, we should, in commemoration of that day, now declare peace; that is, declare that it is our policy to remain at peace. Accordingly I have introduced into this House a concurrent resolution asking that next Saturday, April 6, be set aside for the proper observance of this day. The resolution provides for a joint session of the Senate and House. That to that session the President and his Cabinet and such others as is customary on such occasions be invited. It also provides that the President shall at that time address those assembled and the Nation at large on the subject of peace, stressing our determination to stay out of the conflict. I hope the Rules Committee will see fit to report the resolution. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the Fort Smith Times-Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I received word this morning from the W. P. A. Administrator that the quota in Montana would be cut down from 14,600 for the month of March to 12,025 for the month of April. This is going to bring an untold hardship upon our needy people. We have white people—men, women, and children—in Montana who are without work and in dire need. We have Indians who are now, and have been during the winter months, living in tents without sufficient clothing or food, and this reduction in relief is going to increase the acute distress condition. We seem to have money to take care of the needy in foreign nations, and my thought is that charity begins at home. I fully realize that looking after your own people and attending to your own business does not make headlines, but I want to say that we had better give more attention to the economic needs of our own people than we have been, or else we may not have to

look 3,000 miles across the water for trouble. We are not menaced by any foreign nation in the world, but unemployment is stalking this country, and we had better take heed before it is too late. Therefore let us give our attention to home affairs. [Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the April issue of the National Grange Monthly, which includes a statement by Louis J. Taber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Palladium Item, of Richmond, Ind., of March 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short letter from W. W. Chapin, publisher of the California Argonaut, and to insert an editorial on the national block-booking bill from a nonpartisan standpoint.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I also ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the thing that seems to concern the gentlemen on the right-hand side of the aisle is what they are going to do about relief, and then they say that we cannot look to industry to provide complete employment. I want to say to the Congress that if we had as much red blood in our veins to try to get up here and help the people of this country get jobs as we have to get them a dole, we would give them jobs by changing some of the laws that we have enacted here in the last 4 or 5 years and give industry an opportunity to go ahead and do something without being harassed by the National Labor Relations Board. This will do more to give jobs than any other one thing that we can do and will take people off the dole.

I believe it is time for us to give recognition to some of the things that are going to provide employment for people in private industry and take them off of the dole. This is what we want to do, and we can do it if we will only act wisely and judiciously.

If we were as interested in getting people jobs in industry as getting votes we would help those on the dole. We would help the country and probably this would not be called April-fool day. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests to make. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a quotation from the Gold Reserve Act, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include quotations from the Gold Reserve Act and from opinions of the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from one of my papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for time this afternoon at the close of the business of the day. I shall not desire to use the time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and print in the RECORD a tribute by the United States Maritime Commission to the late Joseph R. Sheehan, former executive director of the Commission, and, at the time of his death, president of the American President Line.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

W. P. A. APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it would be a violation of the rules of the House to question the accuracy of the statements made this morning by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who spoke about the need for W. P. A. appropriations in their respective States. What I am wondering now is how their statements can be true—and I refer to the picture they painted as to the dire distress, the overpowering need for further relief appropriations, the millions of unemployed; how these things can be, after the more than 7 years of reform and recovery legislation which they have given us; after the expenditure of some \$65,000,000,000; after the addition of more than \$25,000,000,000 to the national debt—all expended under the prescription of the gentleman in the White House, who knew just what was wrong with us as a Nation; who knew the remedy which we needed to bring about a full recovery and who promised, if we would let him prescribe, that he would cure all our ills.

Is the picture which was painted by the gentlemen—the one from Missouri, the other from Montana—untrue? It seems not. Rather it appears that our doctor has been administering quack remedies and that, as a physician and curer of domestic ills, he is, by the results, shown to have been a failure. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, Education and the United Mine Workers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Mr. Carl H. Wilken, secretary of the Raw Materials National Council, on reciprocal-trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend and revise my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE TO DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR WOULD BE A MISTAKE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, in a newspaper article on Saturday the statement was made that some 40,000,000 acres of land in the United States forests under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service would probably be transferred to another department of the Government. I call the attention of the Members of the House to what is being done under one of those acts of consolidation which was passed in the interest of economy last year. As far as I know—and I stand subject to correction if I am not correct—the only thing that has been done under those acts authorizing the executive branch of the Government to consolidate departments and transfer from one to the other has been a letterhead-paper proposition.

In other words, the Bureau of Fisheries, for example, is still the Bureau of Fisheries, but under the legislation passed in 1939 it has been transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of the Interior. There was no attempt at any economy, and there has been none. We just have a new letterhead reading "Department of the Interior" instead of "Department of Commerce."

This particular transfer may or may not be a good one. In fact, it may or may not be necessary. But it does show how tremendous power is centralized and placed in the hands of one man. Congress, which appropriates the money necessary for bureaus and commissions and departments, should never have surrendered its prerogative.

All of you will recall that in 1939 attempts were made to transfer the national forests, which are under the supervision of the United States Forest Service, to the Department of the Interior. There were so many protests that such a transfer at that time was reported to be abandoned. The United States Forest Service had done fine work, and no one had any valid reasons why it should be interrupted. After all, its primary purpose is forestry, not recreation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to register a protest against this new proposal which was announced in the newspapers under date of March 30. Bear in mind that these reorganization proposals have now passed out of the hands of Congress and can be done by the President, and unless Congress takes affirmative action to disapprove his procedure it has the effect of a law.

This newspaper announcement indicates that about 40,000,000 acres of the forest land is to be transferred under another reorganization decree. In the district which I have the honor to represent there is the Superior National Forest. The United States Forest Service is doing splendid work in that district, and the sentiment of the people in that territory is not favorable to having the United States forests transferred to the Department of the Interior.

There is no greater conservation agency in the Government than the Forest Service, and its policies ought to be continued. We do not need a national park in northern Minnesota, and those who think otherwise are not familiar with conditions in that section.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Christian Century.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, just because it is an opportunity to do so, I have asked for 1 minute to call attention again to the New York Times Business Index of yesterday. The business index is still going down like a rocket. I do not know that that will affect the State of Montana but I predict

that business conditions are due for a much greater fall than is seen at present. I want the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], who sits beside the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], on whom he must rely for funds this year, to some day tell why this condition seems now so constant in Montana, and whether he sees any hope ahead of conditions there being better.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It will take more than 7 years for this country to recover from the wreck left after the 12 long years preceding the 7 years.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is exactly what I thought the answer would be, and it is such an evasive answer that I would not take time to reply to it if afforded under my request.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS AND FARM PRICES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CURRENCY EXPANSION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the condition to which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] referred evidently exists. Business is "on the skids." It is on its way down to a level with agriculture. You have had industry stilted up by the tariff and other advantages all out of line with agricultural prices, and it is on its way now down to a meeting point with agriculture.

This condition is going to continue until we have a reasonable, controlled expansion of the currency, until we take this gold out of the ground that we have buried in Kentucky and use it for the purposes for which it was intended, and that is the issuing of currency against it, remonetizing silver, and putting that currency and that silver into circulation and raising the price of farm commodities to their normal level. I repeat again you Republicans continue to criticize this administration, but not a man running for President on the Republican ticket, and very few Members who are offering themselves for reelection for the House or Senate will dare to offer the American people a solution of this monetary problem, that must be solved before we get out of this depression. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

WAPATO SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 54, YAKIMA COUNTY, WASH.

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 3824, to provide funds for cooperation with Wapato School District No. 54, Yakima County, Wash., for extension of public-school buildings to be available for Indian children of the Yakima Reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN OFFICERS OF UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE TO MAKE ARRESTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5409, to authorize certain officers of the United States Indian Service to make arrests in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

TRIALS AND JUDGMENTS UPON GOOD BEHAVIOR OF CERTAIN FEDERAL JUDGES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5939, to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain Federal judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. KEAN, Mr. TABER, and Mr. CHURCH objected to consideration of the bill, and it was stricken from the calendar.

PASSAMAQUODDY BAY TIDAL POWER

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 57, authorizing the Secretary of War to cause a completion of surveys, test borings, and foundation investigations to be made to determine the advisability and cost of putting in a small experimental plant for development of tidal power in the waters in and about Passamaquoddy Bay, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such examinations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1790, to authorize additions to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., through exchanges under the act of March 20, 1922, or by proclamation or Executive order.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act approved March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 485), and of the act approved February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. 1090; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 486), are hereby made applicable to the lands excluded from the boundaries of the Tule Indian Reservation by the act of May 17, 1928 (45 Stat. 600), as hereinafter described, which, upon conveyance to the United States, shall be parts of the Sequoia National Forest, and the President of the United States hereby is authorized to add to the said Sequoia National Forest, by proclamation or Executive order, any of said described lands which are in the ownership of the United States:

Southwest quarter southwest quarter section 7;

Section 16 and section 17;

East half northeast quarter, southwest quarter northeast quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, each half southeast quarter section 18;

East half northwest quarter, northwest quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter section 20;

Northwest quarter northwest quarter section 21;

And tract No. 48 in the southeast quarter section 28, all in township 21 south, range 31 east, of the Mount Diablo meridian in California.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6972, to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OSAGE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6314, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING A NATIONAL MISSISSIPPI RIVER PARKWAY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3759, to authorize a National Mississippi River Parkway and matters relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL LAND POLICY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1675, to establish a national land policy, and to provide homesteads free of debt for actual farm families.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE TRIBES JURISDICTIONAL ACT

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 290, referring the claims of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma to the Court of Claims for finding of fact and report to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. WOLCOTT asked unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER NEAR FLORENCE STATION IN THE CITY OF OMAHA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7069, authorizing Douglas County, Nebr., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Florence Station, in the city of Omaha, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LIMITING THE OPERATION OF PRESENT LAWS WITH RESPECT TO COUNSEL IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7032, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to counsel in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. KEAN, Mr. TABER, and Mr. COSTELLO objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

CROP-CONTROL LAW RELATING TO LIEN IMPOSED THEREUNDER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7878, to amend the crop-loan law relating to the lien imposed thereunder, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MILEAGE TABLES AND ALLOWANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 506, relating to mileage tables for the United States Army and other Government agencies and to mileage allowances for persons employed in the offices of Members of House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. KUNKEL objected.

DELAWARE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6535, authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Delaware Tribe of Indians on account of permanent annuities under treaty provisions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6957, to extend to the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended, shall apply to the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington, upon the acceptance of said act by the Indians residing on said reservation at an election called by the Secretary of the Interior, and held in accordance with existing law within 6 months from the date of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COTTONSEED GRADES AND PRICES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8642, to establish and promote the use of standard methods of grading cottonseed, to provide for the collection and dissemination of information on prices and grades of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL MONUMENT AND DIXIE NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8476, to adjust the boundaries of the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to valid existing rights, the following-described lands in the State of Utah are hereby eliminated from the Dixie National Forest and included in and made a part of the Cedar Breaks National Monument, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, to wit:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN

Township 36 south, range 9 west, west half southwest quarter section 22, west half west half section 27, west half west half section 34, west half of lot 8, section 36; township 37 south, range 9 west, west half of lot 3, section 1, lot 4, section 3, comprising four hundred and sixty-five and eighty-one one-hundredths acres.

Sec. 2. That, subject to valid existing rights, the following-described lands in the State of Utah are hereby eliminated from the Cedar Breaks National Monument and included in and made a part of the Dixie National Forest, subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto, to wit:

SALT LAKE MERIDIAN

Township 36 south, range 9 west, northwest quarter northeast quarter, north half northeast quarter northwest quarter, northeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter, east half northwest

quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter section 24, northwest quarter northeast quarter section 36, comprising one hundred and fifteen acres.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO ADMIT CERTAIN ALIENS TO CITIZENSHIP

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6381, for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we had some discussion of this bill the last time it was called on the Calendar. The question has not been cleared up yet. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED NAVAL ORDNANCE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7074, to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, and cannonballs in their respective departments," approved May 22, 1896, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are each hereby authorized, in their discretion, to loan or give to soldiers' monument associations, posts of the Grand Army of the Republic, posts of the American Legion, and other recognized war veteran associations, State museums, and incorporated museums operated and maintained for educational purposes only, whose charter denies them the right to operate for profit, municipal corporations, and posts of the Sons of Veterans Reserve, condemned or obsolete ordnance, guns, projectiles, books, manuscripts, works of art, drawings, plans, models, and other condemned or obsolete material which may not be needed in the service of either of said Departments.

"Such loan or gift shall be made subject to rules and regulations covering the same in each Department, and the Government shall be at no expense in connection with any such loan or gift."

Sec. 2. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARROWROCK DAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8498, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the payment of the costs of repairs, resurfacing, improvement, and enlargement of the Arrowrock Dam in 20 annual installments, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of avoiding an unduly high operation and maintenance assessment in any one year and to keep the operation and maintenance charges in connection with the Arrowrock division of the Boise reclamation project within the ability of the water users to pay, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow the irrigation districts of the said Arrowrock division and the irrigation districts, ditch companies, and water users who have assumed obligations to pay proportionate parts of the estimated cost of the operation and maintenance of the Arrowrock Reservoir, to pay the costs, as determined conclusively by said Secretary, incurred in the repair, resurfacing, and improvement of the Arrowrock Dam and in increasing the height thereof (to provide additional capacity to offset past and, to some extent, future losses of capacity resulting from the deposit of silt in the said reservoir) in 20 annual installments instead of requiring the payment of all of such operation and maintenance costs in 1 year, as provided in section 5 of the act of Congress of August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. 686).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the period in line 12, page 2, and add the following: *Provided*, That such costs, for the purpose of any amendatory contracts affecting the construction charges of Arrowrock Dam that

may be entered into as authorized by the act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be treated as part of the construction charges of said dam, and as payable in the same manner as such charges.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOUNT RUSHMORE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8357, to amend the Mount Rushmore Memorial Act of 1938.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman understand what the bill is and what it does?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. KELLER. It is simply an authorization to provide an additional 160 acres to the 1,500 already set aside as the Mount Rushmore Park. The necessity for acquiring this additional ground is to preserve the natural beauty of the park and prevent the establishment of a lot of hot-dog stands and other undesirable things that might be set up along this approach.

Mr. RICH. We have already taken a great amount of territory for this Mount Rushmore Memorial.

Mr. KELLER. Not as much as needed.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that we are getting bill after bill after bill to increase the size of national monuments. In the case of the Mount Rushmore Memorial the original purpose was that the Federal Government should spend \$200,000 on the memorial. So far we have spent about \$700,000, and more will be asked in proportion as the size of the monument is increased. No matter what we do there will always be someone else wanting to extend the boundaries. We must call a halt to it somewhere.

Mr. KELLER. This bill was accompanied by a unanimous report from the Committee on the Library. It was thoroughly considered.

Mr. RICH. I think the bill should go over until the next Consent Calendar day. We want to give it more study.

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman will not look at it again, and he knows it.

Mr. RICH. I will look at it. When I say I will do a thing I will do it. I do not want the gentleman to make a statement like that. He should give some of his time to the Labor Committee and go down there and go to work, not criticize some other Member for what he may do.

Mr. KELLER. I spend as much time at the Labor Committee as the gentleman talks nonsense.

Mr. RICH. All the gentleman does is talk nonsense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Unanimous consent to consider the bill has already been granted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asked unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that, but the bill had been submitted to the House and the consent of the House had been granted to consider the bill. The gentleman's request came on an amendment that was offered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not so recollect the facts. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to submit the unanimous-consent request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

BRINGING MENOMINEE INDIANS WITHIN COMPENSATION ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 607, to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 40 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, is amended by inserting after the words "Panama Railroad Co." the following: "and all persons, other than independent contractors and their employees, employed on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin subsequent to September 7, 1916, in operations conducted pursuant to the act entitled 'An act to authorize the cutting of timber, the manufacture and sale of lumber, and the preservation of the forests on the Menominee Indian Reservation in the State of Wisconsin,' approved March 28, 1908, as amended, or any other act relating to tribal timber and logging operations on the Menominee Reservation."

SEC. 2. Any award heretofore made by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission under such act of September 7, 1916, to persons coming within the purview of the first section hereof, for disability or death resulting from a personal injury sustained prior to the enactment of this act, shall be valid, if such award would be valid if made in respect to an injury or death sustained after the enactment of this act. Any claim for disability or death to any person coming within the purview of the first section hereof, if such disability or death occurred prior to the enactment of this act, may be filed at any time within 1 year after the enactment hereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, after the word "act", strike out the remainder of the line and down through line 21 and insert the following: "Claim on account of disability or death of any person coming within the purview of the first section hereof, for benefits on account of injury incurred subsequent to July 28, 1935, may be filed under said act: *Provided*, That such claim be filed within 1 year after the approval hereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 445, to establish a commission for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 461, providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 226 be substituted for House Joint Resolution 461.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, caused by the resignation of John C. Merriam, be filled by the appointment of Vannevar Bush, a resident of the city of Washington, for the statutory term of 6 years.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 461) was laid on the table.

TO SET ASIDE CERTAIN LANDS FOR THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7833, to set aside certain lands for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the payments prescribed by section 2 hereof the following-described lands are hereby eliminated from the Chippewa National Forest and permanently reserved for the use of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe without in any manner affecting existing reserves for church, cemetery, and other purposes, or individual rights or interest in said lands: South half northwest quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 12; northwest quarter northwest quarter, west half northeast quarter northwest quarter, south half northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter, lots 2, 4, 5, and 6, section 13; northeast quarter southeast quarter, section 14; lots 11, 12, 13, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9, section 24, township 142 north, range 31 west, fifth principal meridian, Minnesota, excepting a tract containing approximately one and ninety-one-hundredths acres, being that portion of lot 4, section 13, township 142 north, range 31 west, beginning at angle point 1, lot 5, section 13, township 142 north, range 31 west; thence north thirty-three degrees forty-two minutes east one hundred and twenty-nine and five-tenths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees forty-eight minutes east two hundred and thirty-one and four-tenths feet; thence south one degree fifty-four minutes west eighty-five and two-tenths feet; thence south nine degrees thirty-one minutes east two hundred and five and two-tenths feet; thence south nine degrees no minutes west eighty and four-tenths feet; thence south forty-one degrees nineteen minutes west one hundred and nineteen and four-tenths feet to angle point 4, lot 5; thence along the boundary of lot 5, north fifty-one degrees no minutes west one hundred and twenty and one-tenth feet to angle point 5, lot 5, north thirty-seven degrees forty-five minutes east one hundred and twenty and one-tenth feet to angle point 6, lot 5, north fifty-one degrees no minutes west two hundred and eighty-seven and one-tenth feet to angle point 1, lot 5, and point of beginning.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to withdraw from the Minnesota Chippewa tribal fund now held in trust in the Treasury of the United States a sufficient sum to reimburse the United States for the land and timber thereon, the value of the land to be calculated at \$1.25 per acre, and the value of the timber to be ascertained by the Secretary of Agriculture after the same has been examined and appraised under his supervision: *Provided, however,* That the transaction contemplated in this and the preceding section shall be effected only with the consent of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe expressed through the body authorized to represent it: *And provided further,* That all money received by the United States under the authority of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and the same is hereby appropriated for the acquisition of forest land within the Chippewa National Forest under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 513, 519, 521).

SEC. 3. That exchanges of Indian allotted, restricted, and tribal lands for lands in the Chippewa National Forest are hereby authorized. In order to consummate exchanges involving allotted and restricted Indian lands, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept relinquishments or conveyances of Indian lands, which lands shall thereupon become a part of the Chippewa National Forest, and to issue trust patents to the Indians for the lands received by them in exchange: *Provided,* That with the consent of the Indians involved title to the lands received in any such exchange may be taken in the name of the tribe, in which case the transfer of title shall be evidenced by an order of the Secretary of Agriculture transferring the lands to the Secretary of the Interior in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe: *Provided further,* That exchanges involving tribal lands shall be made only with the consent of the Indians and shall be evidenced by appropriate orders of transfer executed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further,* That the land exchanges authorized herein shall be made on the basis of lands of equal value, and no exchange shall be made unless it is first approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BLACKFEET INDIAN PROJECT, MONTANA

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 334, to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior in deferring the collection of certain irrigation charges against lands under the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 153 be substituted for the House joint resolution, it being identical with the House joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 153

Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior in deferring the collection of certain irrigation charges against lands under the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project

Whereas the act of Congress approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), provides that the Secretary of the Interior may adjust, defer, or cancel irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands within Indian irrigation projects, where conditions are found to justify such action, subject to the approval of Congress; and

Whereas an investigation of conditions affecting the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana, is contemplated within the near future pursuant to the provisions of the said act; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has deferred certain irrigation charges against lands of the said project which are now delinquent or will become due and payable before the proposed investigation can be completed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That in accordance with the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), the action of the Secretary of the Interior in deferring such charges under said irrigation project is hereby approved.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) was laid on the table.

DAM ACROSS STANSBURY CREEK IN BALTIMORE COUNTY, MD.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2977, authorizing the construction and maintenance of a dike or dam across Stansbury Creek in Baltimore County, Md.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Glenn L. Martin Co. and its successors and assigns to construct and maintain a dike or dam across Stansbury Creek at a point suitable to the interests of navigation about five-eighths mile above the mouth of Stansbury Creek in the county of Baltimore in the State of Maryland, in accordance with the provisions of section 9 of the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1899.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING FREE HIGHWAY BRIDGE ACROSS PEARL RIVER AT CARTHAGE, MISS.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 3209, granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pearl River at or near Carthage in the State of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pearl River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Carthage, Leake County, Miss., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, MIDDLETOWN, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7406, granting the consent of Congress to the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Middletown, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved

March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintenance, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, MILLERSBURG, PA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7407, granting the consent of Congress to the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to know if this bridge is on a public highway and if that highway is built with Federal funds. I am constitutionally opposed to giving private concerns the right to build toll bridges on highways that are built in whole or in part with Federal funds. I have no objection to the State of Pennsylvania or any subdivision thereof building a free bridge, but I believe that it is a bad practice to turn these highways over to a few bridge companies so they may bottle up the highways and exact a toll from everybody who passes along the highways. I want to know if the gentleman is willing to agree to an amendment to strike out that provision with reference to the toll bridge.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know whether or not the gentleman recalls it, but about 14 years ago I started in this House a single-handed fight against toll bridges constructed and promoted by private individuals. On the first roll call that I forced, my motion received 13 votes. However, I kept on and finally the House adopted a policy which the committee has been carrying out declining to let private interests build toll bridges. This particular bill involves the State, and there never has been any objection to a State or a subdivision of a State building a toll bridge. In the end they will become free bridges.

Mr. RANKIN. This bill reads "the State or." I do not believe the gentleman read this bill carefully.

Mr. COCHRAN. Or representatives of a State.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand, this does not refer to representatives of a State; it is a bridge company.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. The bill provides for the State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either one of them separately, or jointly, to construct this bridge. This is a public organization, it is not a private organization.

Mr. RANKIN. It is the State of Pennsylvania?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Very well.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that if someone wishes to build a bridge and the people who use that bridge are willing to pay a toll so the bridge may be paid for and the Federal Government will not have to levy taxes to pay for it, it seems to me they should be allowed to do so. That is sound legislation and certainly good

business. We have bridges at Harrisburg, Pa., and we have bridges on the other side above York, Pa., over the Susquehanna River. If the local people want to construct a bridge at Middletown and for some reason want to pay for it, why not let them do it? I am not interested in someone's trying to make any money out of it or to gouge the people. I want to serve them.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. RICH. But if the State authority looked after the matter and saw that those who built the bridge could not make more than 5 or 6 percent on their money, would it not be wise business procedure for us Members of Congress to follow to let the people who use the bridge pay for it? That seems sensible. That is good business. That is the logical thing to do. And it will not cost any person a penny who does not use it, and those who use it pay for service rendered.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that if nobody was involved except the local people his contention might be correct, but if this bridge is on a transcontinental highway that is built with Federal funds, a highway the people of the whole country use, I am not willing to turn it over to a private bridge company.

Mr. RICH. I will guarantee that the State Highway Department of Pennsylvania is not going to let anybody build a toll bridge by which they will hoodwink and gouge the people of Pennsylvania. If the people are willing to pay the toll, then I believe we ought to let this bill go through and render a service without cost to the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Susquehanna River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Millersburg, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintenance, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE ACROSS THE DELAWARE RIVER BETWEEN SHOHOLA, PA., AND BARRYVILLE, N. Y.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7655, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River between the village of Barryville, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the highway bridge across the Delaware River between points in the village of Barryville, Sullivan County, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pike County, Pa., authorized to be built by the Interstate Bridge Commission of the State of New York and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by an act of Congress approved June 19, 1936, heretofore extended by an act of Congress approved August 23, 1937, are hereby further extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from June 19, 1939.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGALIZING AN EXISTING BRIDGE ACROSS THE NESTUCCA RIVER AT PACIFIC CITY, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7989, to legalize a bridge across the Nestucca River at Pacific City, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War are hereby authorized to approve the location and plans of a bridge already constructed by the county of Tillamook across the Nestucca River at Pacific City, Oreg.

Sec. 2. That when the location and plans of said bridge have been so approved, said bridge shall be deemed a lawful structure and subject to the laws enacted by Congress for the protection and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "Oregon", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That said bridge has been authorized by the legislature of the State of Oregon and as located and constructed affords free, easy, and unobstructed navigation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER NEAR JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8320, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Jefferson Barracks, Mo., authorized to be built by the county of St. Louis, State of Missouri, by an act of Congress approved August 7, 1939, is hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from August 7, 1940.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "River", strike out "at or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo."

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT OR NEAR CHESTER, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8372, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Chester, Ill., authorized to be built by the city of Chester, Ill., by an act of Congress approved July 18, 1939, are hereby extended 1 and 3 years, respectively, from July 18, 1940.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS OLD CHANNEL OF THE WABASH RIVER, POSEY COUNTY, IND.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8467, authorizing the Superior Oil Co., a California corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge or causeway across the old channel of the Wabash River from Cut-Off Island, Posey County, Ind., to White County, Ill.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if they could explain this bill?

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for any objection to the bill. If the gentleman had only noticed where the bridge is being constructed, he would not have asked the question.

Mr. SCHULTE. I did not know there was any such town in the State of Indiana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate interstate commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes, the Superior Oil Co., a California corporation, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge or causeway (including approaches thereto) across the old channel of the Wabash River in order to connect Cut-Off Island, Posey County, Ind., with the highway system in White County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

Sec. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the Superior Oil Co., a California corporation, all the rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge or causeway, and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the States in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid for according to the laws of each such State, respectively, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such States, respectively.

Sec. 3. The authority herein granted shall extend not only to the Superior Oil Co., a California corporation as aforesaid, but also to the owners of Cut-Off Island, Ind., at the date of the enactment of this act and any future owners of such island.

Sec. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all of section 2, lines 5 to 18, inclusive, on page 2.

Page 2, line 19, after "Sec.", change "3" to "2."

Page 2, line 24, after "Sec.", change "4" to "3."

Amend the title.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the Superior Oil Co., a California corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge or causeway and approaches thereto across the old channel of the Wabash River from Cut-Off Island, Posey County, Ind., to White County, Ill."

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER NEAR RANDOLPH, MO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8669, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo., authorized to be built by the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., its successors and assigns, by an act of Congress approved May 24, 1928, heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved March 1, 1929, May 14, 1930, February 6, 1931, May 6, 1932, January 19, 1933, April 9, 1934, April 10, 1936, and May 31, 1938, are hereby further extended 2 and 4 years, respectively, from May 24, 1940.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "the" and insert "The."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8423, to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard," approved January 12, 1938.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard," approved January 12, 1938 (52 Stat. 4), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury, at the direction of the President, shall assemble annually a Coast Guard Personnel Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board), to be composed of not less than five commissioned officers of the rank of captain or above on the active list of the Coast Guard. It shall be the duty of the Board (a) to recommend for retirement such commissioned officers of the Coast Guard who have 30 or more years of service, as the Board determines, in its discretion, should be retired from active service, (b) to recommend for retirement such commissioned officers of the Coast Guard who have been placed out of line of promotion and who have 10 years or more of commissioned service, as the Board determines, in its discretion, should be retired from active service, and (c) to recommend for placing out of line of promotion such lieutenant commanders on the active list, as the Board determines, in its discretion, should be placed out of line of promotion. The proceedings, findings, and recommendations of the Board shall be transmitted to the Commandant of the Coast Guard for review. If the Commandant shall approve the recommendations of the Board, notification thereof shall be given by him in writing to each officer concerned, who, for the first time under this act, is recommended for retirement or for placing out of line of promotion; and any such officer who, within 30 days after receipt of such notification, files with the Commandant a written protest of the action taken by the Board in his case, shall not be retired involuntarily or placed out of line of promotion under this act unless a subsequent annual Board, none of the members of which were members of the previous Board which recommended such officer's retirement or placing out of line of promotion, determines, in its discretion, that such officer should be retired or placed out of line of promotion, and so recommends, in which case such officer may, upon approval by the President, be retired from active service with retired pay as prescribed by section 3 hereof, or be placed out of line of promotion, as the case may be, as hereinafter provided. At the expiration of 30 days after receipt by an officer of notice aforesaid, in the event that no such protest is filed by him, such officer may upon approval by the President, be retired from active service with retired pay as prescribed by section 3 hereof, or be placed out of line of promotion, as the case may be, as hereinafter provided. If the Commandant shall disapprove any recommendation of the Board, the officer concerned shall retain his status in the Coast Guard to the same extent as if his case had not been considered by such Board. Except as hereinafter provided, each recommendation of the Board which is finally approved by the Commandant, together with the proceedings and findings of the Board, shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury for further review, and if the Secretary shall disapprove any recommendation of the Board, the officer concerned shall retain his status in the Coast Guard to the same extent as if his case had not been considered by such Board. Each recommendation of the Board which is not disapproved by the Secretary shall be laid before the President by the Secretary with his recommendation in the case. The President may, in any calendar year, pursuant to recommendations so laid before him—

"(a) Place out of line of promotion such number of lieutenant commanders on the active list as will not exceed the whole number nearest to 2 percent of the officers in that grade as of January 1 of such year; except that such limitation shall not be construed to limit the number of lieutenant commanders who may be placed out of line of promotion, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, for failing to establish their mental, moral, and professional fitness for promotion.

"(b) Place upon the retired list such number of commissioned officers who have 30 or more years of service as will not exceed the whole number nearest to 5 percent of the number of officers falling within that classification on January 1 of such year.

"(c) Place upon the retired list any officer who has been placed out of line of promotion and who has 10 years or more of commissioned service."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDIANS OF THE CROW TRIBE, MONTANA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8916, to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Tribe, Montana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the period of trust on lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Reservation, Mont., upon which the trust period expired July 14, 1931, or at any other time prior to the approval of this act, and for which lands patents in fee have not been issued, is hereby reimposed and extended to May 23, 1940: *Provided*, That further extension of the period of trust may be made by the President, in his discretion, as provided by section 5 of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 388), and the act of June 21, 1906 (34 Stat. 326).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAR ROUTE MAIL CARRIERS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1214, to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO SPECIAL ASSISTANTS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4366, to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of United States against Doheny executors.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice there is a minority report in connection with this bill signed by six members of the committee. It is very obvious when there is a minority report accompanying a bill that it is not going to be passed by unanimous consent. My only reason for asking that it be passed over without prejudice is that the committee might want to request that it be taken from the calendar because there is not any chance whatsoever of a bill with a minority report on it going through on the Consent Calendar, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PATENTS FOR LANDS HELD UNDER COLOR OF TITLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7736) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if within 5 years after passage of this act it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that a tract or tracts of public land in the State of Michigan, not exceeding in the aggregate 160 acres, has or have been held in good faith and in peaceable, adverse possession by a citizen of the United States, his ancestors or grantors, for more than 20 years prior to the approval of this act under claim or color of title, and that valuable improvements have been placed on such land or some part thereof has been reduced to cultivation, the Secretary may, in his discretion, upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre, cause a patent or patents to issue for such land to any such citizen: *Provided*, That the term "citizen," as used herein, shall be held to include a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State or Territory thereof.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "valuable."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Secretary," strike out "may, in his discretion" and insert the word "shall."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 400, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1940, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States of America is authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1940, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

DEFINING CERTAIN MINING PRACTICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8285) with reference to certain mining practices and defining unfair trade practices in certain instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I have prepared an amendment to this bill to make it general in character. In my opinion, the bill, as far as it goes, is a worthy bill and should be passed. I have taken the matter up with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], who introduced the bill, and he suggests that it be amended; and I have prepared an amendment including all of the products and articles and the importation of articles produced on which there is a patent. Some time ago my attention was called to a magazine article in which there were photographs of infringements of patents held by citizens of the United States in foreign countries, and these are imported and come in competition with our products, and there seems to be no way now, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Mineral case, by which the owner of the patent has any claim against the importer or anyone else. My amendment would make this general, to include all articles and products.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be deemed an unfair trade practice to import for use, sale, or exchange any minerals mined, produced, or processed by use of the flotation process except where such minerals are produced or mined under authority of the owner of such flotation process.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That it shall be deemed an unfair trade practice and a violation of the right of the patentee to import for use, sale, or exchange any minerals mined, produced, or processed by use of any mining process covered by the claims of any outstanding United States letters patent heretofore or hereafter issued, except where such minerals are produced, processed, or mined under authority of the owner of such process."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute for the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wolcott: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"That it shall be deemed an unfair trade practice and in violation of the right of the patentee to import for use, sale, or exchange any article, mineral, or product produced, processed, or mined by use of any process covered by the claims of any outstanding United States letters patent, or to import for use, sale, or exchange any article, mineral, or product which infringes the right of any patentee under letters patent so issued, except where such articles are produced, processed, mined, or imported under authority of the owner of such process or patent."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan for the committee amendment.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to limit the importation of articles, products, and minerals produced, processed, or mined under process covered by outstanding United States patents; to define unfair trade practices in certain instances, and for other purposes."

UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8930) to amend section 202 (3) World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LXXXVI—239

TOMAH INDIAN SCHOOL, WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7530, to transfer the site and buildings of the Tomah Indian School to the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized in his discretion to transfer to the State of Wisconsin under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe all or any part of the land and buildings comprising the Tomah Indian School at Tomah, Wis.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer to the State of Wisconsin, upon such terms and in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon, for institutional or other public use, title to all or any part of the property known and designated as the Tomah Indian School located at Tomah, Wis."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTIETAM BATTLEFIELD SITE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1780, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property for the Antietam Battlefield site in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like someone to explain this bill, and how much ground they want to add to this battlefield. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9047, to provide for the transfer of United States prisoners in certain cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SUBSECTION (D) OF SECTION 4 OF THE ACT OF CONGRESS APPROVED MAY 26, 1924

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8753, to amend subsection (d) of section 4 of the act of Congress approved May 26, 1924, entitled "An act to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. CLEVENGER objected.

Mrs. O'DAY. Will the gentleman reserve the objection?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; I will reserve the objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill gives to women the same privileges that foreign men, ministers, and professors have had ever since the immigration law was passed. Four hundred and seventeen men have come in under the non-quota law and have brought their wives and children. In that length of time 47 women professors have come in, and I know that most of them were spinsters. Now we want legislation to change that, to give women the same privilege as men.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. O'DAY], it is legislation of this type that provides an additional loophole in our immigration laws.

So that my colleagues may fully understand the far-reaching effect of section 4-D of the Immigration Act of 1924, I wish to call to your attention that since the act became effective in 1924 a total of 15,578 nonquota immigrant aliens, as ministers, professors, their wives, and unmarried children, were admitted to the United States.

For the further information of my colleagues, I am inserting herewith a break-down of the 15,578 nonquota immigrant aliens referred to above, showing pertinent facts compiled by the United States Immigration Service.

Nonquota immigrant aliens admitted since July 1, 1924, under sec. 4d of the Immigration Act of 1924, as ministers and professors and their wives and unmarried children; also ministers and professors admitted since 1932, by sex, as specified¹

Fiscal year	Ministers	Wives of ministers	Children of ministers	Professors	Wives of professors	Children of professors
1925	694	295	496	187	49	25
1926	664	235	436	151	39	26
1927	595	338	721	138	40	21
1928	594	226	393	124	40	27
1929	507	212	355	118	40	20
1930	508	215	382	160	50	25
1931	383	144	226	109	38	43
1932	291	81	132	100	35	21
1933: ¹						
Men	201	41	57	38	19	14
Women	3					
1934:						
Men	193	69	97	51	28	24
Women	3					
1935:						
Men	197	60	102	45	26	22
Women	2					
1936:						
Men	240	85	129	42	20	16
Women	1					
1937:						
Men	230	79	128	47	26	26
Women	3					
1938:						
Men	281	70	105	48	29	28
Women	2					
1939:						
Men	322	148	234	215	117	88
Women	1					
6 months, July-December 1939:						
Men	174	94	116	153	93	71
Women						
Total	6,089	2,392	4,099	1,812	689	497

¹ Statistics showing classes of admission under the act of 1924 by sex, not compiled prior to 1933.

The committee report on the measure now before us—H. R. 8753—states that in the last 5 years 46 female professors came into the United States nonquota. It is true under the existing law they are not permitted to bring their husbands or unmarried children under 18 years of age. To care for this group of husbands and unmarried children we are asked to approve H. R. 8753 as an amendment to the Immigration Act of 1924. If this amendment is approved not only will we take care of the husbands and unmarried children of the 46 female professors now in the United States, but another loophole will be provided in our immigration laws that will permit the influx of more aliens; thus further hampering the efforts of the American people to solve their own unemployment problem. The plight of 10,000,000 unemployed Americans is the real question before this Congress at the present moment.

This amendment vitally concerns this question of unemployment, whether it permits the admission of a dozen nonquota immigrants, or a thousand such persons. Therefore, I take the position, that this amendment rather than being assigned to the Consent Calendar of the House, where debate is denied, rightfully should come to this floor under a rule granting full debate and a thorough analysis of the effects of the amendment so that every Member of the House may have knowledge of the serious consequences to result from its enactment.

The problem of the 46 female professors may be solved by the introduction of a private bill in each instance, and the merits of the individual case considered.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insist on my objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MORE ADEQUATE COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 9000, to provide for more adequate compensation for certain dependents of World War veterans, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will allow this bill to be passed. It provides compensation for the widows and orphans of World War veterans; it is following precedents set by Congress for the dependents of veterans of the Civil War and the Spanish-American War. I hope the gentleman will allow this measure to go through.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the bill provides for a possible annual cost of over \$48,000,000. Of course, the committee, in making its estimate of the bill, presumed that only half of those who are eligible the first year will make application, and for that reason they cut the cost of the bill down to a possible \$24,000,000. But the bill provides for benefits to widows and children without regard to the cause of the veteran's death, or requirement of the existence of a service-connected disability at the time of death. This bill provides for general pensions for all widows and dependents, whether they be children or parents, of all veterans who served for a period of 90 days and were honorably discharged. To my mind we are stepping out on a very vast program that may run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually. I think it would be a dangerous precedent for the Congress to establish by this act. Once the requirement of a service-connected disability is waived for the benefit of widows and dependents it will be only a short step to waiving the service-connection requirements for the veterans themselves. A veteran who has suffered no disability during his war service does not have a claim against the Government for compensation. Since the veteran does not have a claim, and after all, it was the veteran who went to war and not his dependents, then certainly the dependents cannot have a claim against the Government. This legislation is purely a gratuity that cannot be justified, but which will cost the Government possibly \$48,000,000 the first year and an ever-increasing amount each year thereafter.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid the gentleman did not understand the proposition. This bill will not begin to cost \$48,000,000 a year. It will not cost \$25,000,000. The chances are it will take so many of these widows and orphans and dependents off of the relief rolls that it will not cost any more than we are paying now. In addition to that, this bill is even a limitation on the legislation governing compensation for widows and orphans of other wars, in that it only provides for compensation of those widows without children who married the veteran prior to July 3, 1921, the legal date of the closing of the World War. Many thousands of these widows with these little children are on relief; and I submit veterans' widows ought not be compelled to rear the veterans' orphan children on relief. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection and let this bill go through.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I simply asked that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. I think the gentleman ought to withdraw that. I will have to object to that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will state that the committee report shows that during the first year 30,500 widows alone, 66,700 widows with children, and 23,500 children are going to be affected by this legislation.

The committee giving its statement as to the possible costs, cutting their own figures in half stated that the bill would cost approximately \$19,957,000, bringing on the rolls the dependents of approximately 60,300 deceased World War veterans.

Further as to the parents, it is estimated that the parents of approximately 32,800 deceased veterans would be entitled to compensation at a cost of approximately \$8,472,000 the first year. Quoting the committee report, it states:

However, if it can be assumed that one-half of those that apply will be paid the first year, the cost for this group would approximate \$4,236,000 bringing on the rolls the parents of approximately 16,400 deceased veterans.

The committee's own report taking their half figures states that this bill will cost approximately \$24,000,000 the first year. If all the widows and dependents applied the next year, it would cost over \$48,000,000; and every year veterans are dying off so as to continually increase the number. Their widows and dependent children and parents would be entitled under this legislation to come in and obtain a pension. You are giving a blanket pension to all dependents of veterans who served in the war regardless of whether the veteran had any disability. For the first time you are about to eliminate the requirement of service connection. To my mind, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why we should single out that group of civilians who wore the uniform for a short period of time, suffered no disability, and then say to their widows and to their dependents, "You shall have a pension," but turn to all other civilians regardless of what disability they may incur in civilian life and say they shall have no compensation at all unless it be under the old-age pension acts. Why one small group should be so singled out and given pensions is far beyond me to understand, and I frankly state to this House that every piece of legislation of this kind that we pass is used simply as a springboard to dive farther into the Treasury pool in order to obtain further benefits.

If you pass this legislation, there is absolutely no question in my mind but what you are going to come in here next with a bill providing universal pensions for all veterans who served in the World War regardless of whether they suffered any disability; and, remember, over 4,000,000 veterans served in the World War. If we are going to grant universal pensions to those veterans, the cost is going to be not only prohibitive but it is going to plunge us into bankruptcy. The passage of such legislation as the pending bill is only a step toward far greater expenditures in spite of all the benefits which have already been conferred on the World War veterans. The gentleman from Mississippi states that he is only trying to do for the World War veterans what has been done for the veterans of other wars. Whenever this argument is made, the full facts and the complete picture are never presented. Instead, certain very astonishing facts and figures are seldom referred to or revealed. The long list of extra benefits which were extended to the World War veterans which the veterans of other wars did not get and which amount to so staggering a sum that it becomes well-nigh incredible, is a matter which is not mentioned.

For the benefit of the taxpayers of this country, who, in the long run, are called upon to finance the benefits disbursed by reason of such legislation as this, it will be interesting to review the cost of pensions and compensation which, since the year 1790 until June 30, 1939, totaled \$13,702,692,413.96. The total expenditures for pensions of Civil War veterans through June 30, 1939, amounted to \$8,006,533,061.14. The total expenditures for veterans' pensions and compensation does not take into consideration other benefits that were given to World War veterans. For example, under the war-risk policies, the Government has paid to the veterans \$2,136,101,862.63, and the veterans contributed something over \$454,000,000. It has been the belief of many American taxpayers that the World War veterans have paid for all the insurance they got, but this is not an accurate statement; they paid less than 25 percent of the cost of the war-risk insurance. The war-risk insurance should not be confused with Government life insurance, however, as this is self-sustaining.

During the World War, veterans who had dependents could allot \$15 of their pay for such dependents, and the Government made an additional allowance in various amounts to their dependents. These allowances amounted to appropriations of over \$1,580,000,000. The dependents of the Civil War and Spanish-American War were not honored by such gratuities.

In order to eliminate pensions for World War veterans, vocational training laws were enacted in 1918. Eligibility was determined for vocational training of 179,519 World War veterans. Of the total number of World War veterans benefited by this act, 128,747 satisfactorily completed the courses prescribed for them. The total cost of vocational training was \$644,804,963.82.

After the World War period, the various veteran groups petitioned Congress for a cash bonus for World War veterans and as a result of their concentrated efforts over a period of years, the World War Adjusted Compensation Act was passed. This act, as you all know, provided that veterans would be given an adjusted service certificate which would become due in 20 years, with a loan value on the certificate which increased in value after the first 2 years. What happened to this law is history, as the veterans shortly after receiving their certificates demanded full payment of the certificates and 4,117,473 veterans and their dependents have been paid either by bonds or check a sum of \$3,765,473,212.49. These certificates under the original act would not have become due until 1945 if the veteran filed for them in 1925.

Apparently every major program of the veteran organizations has been to provide certain benefits to their respective group, which would eliminate the possibility of veterans demanding pensions. As a result of this millions of dollars have been appropriated. For instance, the sum total of \$200,044,766 was made available for construction purposes during the past 20 years, and as a result of this huge expenditure the Veterans' Administration is now operating hospital facilities at 84 locations in 45 States and the District of Columbia. These facilities have a bed capacity of 54,779, and when the program is completed the total bed capacity will be around 100,000. Since March 3, 1919, when the acquisition of Government facilities was first authorized for the treatment of veterans of the World War, there have been 2,028,865 admissions of United States veterans to hospitals, of which 165,776 were made during this year. Since June 7, 1924, when hospitalization was first authorized for veterans of all wars without regard to the origin of their disabilities, 1,206,966, or about 75 percent of the admissions, have been for treatment of disabilities not connected with service. Over 92 percent of the admissions last year were on account of non-service-connected disabilities. The granting of hospitalization to World War veterans for disabilities which are not service-connected is purely a gratuity at the expense of the taxpayers, and unlike service-connected disabilities cannot be justified as something to which the veteran is rightly entitled as compensation from his Government for service rendered. Of the United States veterans admitted to hospitals during last year 90 percent were World War veterans.

It was not long, however, after the World War Veterans' Act of June 7, 1924, which embraced new principles in the payment of compensation to veterans that far exceeded those of any previous group, that the Disability Allowance Act was passed. This law, as you know, provided pensions to World War veterans who did not have any disabilities attributable to their military service. The total cost of the Disability Allowance Act was \$190,334,347.54, and on June 30, 1933, when these veterans were taken off the pension rolls due to the Economy Act there were 412,482 veterans in receipt of disability allowance. There are, however, remaining on the rolls 55,739 World War veterans receiving permanent total non-service-connected benefits. The annual value of awards for these veterans amounts to \$18,092,638. In addition to this staggering sum there has been expended for compensation for World War veterans the sum in excess of over \$3,000,000,000.

There has never been a country in the world's history that has been so generous and liberal with its veterans and their dependents, especially the World War veteran group. Regardless of the fact that World War veterans have received insurance benefits, their dependents have received allotment and allowance benefits, free hospitalization, adjusted compensation—bonus—disability allowance for non-service-connected disabilities, and liberal compensation benefits for service-connected disabilities that cost the taxpayers of this country over \$11,000,000,000, which is more than two-thirds the benefits received by veterans other than the World War group, now we are faced with a pension drive by the World War veterans for widows and orphans of that war which will cost the taxpayers an additional \$48,000,000 the first year, and which will increase annually by large amounts that will only be exceeded by the cost of future legislation when the World War veteran himself makes his demand for universal pensions in a sum that will definitely bankrupt the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

EXTENSION TO CERTAIN CIVILIANS OF PRIVILEGES OF THE SOLDIERS' HOMES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1008, to confer to certain persons who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China relief expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say, in reply to the gentleman from California, that those old people who would have been benefited by the passage of the last bill, as has just been explained in the Well of this House, are being thrown off of relief; they are being thrown off of W. P. A.; they are being thrown off without anything.

So far as concerns the creating of a precedent by the passage of such bill and its laying the groundwork for further legislation, no man has any right to make that kind of charge against it in this House. What we are trying to do is to hold this veterans' legislation down for these dependent widows, children, and parents. We are trying to hold it down the very best we can; and to broadcast a speech like that, attacking the veterans of this country and stating that it means a pension for all veterans of the World War, is nothing in God's world but propaganda that ought not to go into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill under consideration has no relationship whatsoever to the previous bill, to whose consideration I objected. The pending bill has to do with the granting to certain civilians who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, the benefits of hospitalization, and the privileges of the soldiers' homes.

In view of the fact that the report does not contain any statement from any one of the three departments of Government that are concerned I feel that this legislation is not entitled to the consideration of the House at this time. It is my understanding that the War Department is opposed to the legislation in view of the fact that it provides that civilians may be placed in the Washington Soldier's Home, an institution maintained by funds derived from deductions from the pay of soldiers serving in the military forces of the country. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

ENFORCEMENT LAWS PROHIBITING THE IMPORTATION OF PIRATICAL COPIES OF WORKS COPYRIGHTED IN THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2689, to amend section 33 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 33 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 33. That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General are hereby empowered and required to make and enforce individually or jointly such rules and regulations as shall prevent the importation into the United States of articles prohibited importation by this act, and may require, as conditions precedent to exclusion of any work in which copyright is claimed, the copyright proprietor or any person claiming actual or potential injury by reason of actual or contemplated importations of copies of such work to file with the Post Office Department or the Treasury Department a certificate of the Register of Copyrights that the provisions of section 12 of this act, as amended, have been fully complied with, and to give notice of such compliance to postmasters or to customs officers at the ports of entry in the United States in such form and accompanied by such exhibits as may be deemed necessary for the practical and efficient administration and enforcement of the provisions of sections 30 and 31 of this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PURCHASE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR SAN CARLOS INDIANS (ARIZONA)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6796, to authorize the purchase of certain lands for the San Carlos Apache Tribe, Arizona.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, to ask the author of this bill a question. The cost of this property is estimated to be \$19,134 for the land for this Indian tribe. Who is going to purchase this land?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the land will be purchased by the Indian Bureau and that price is approximate because an agreement has not been entered into. About 600 acres of land will be purchased out of funds already appropriated or to be appropriated later to the San Carlos Indians of the San Carlos Indian Reservation. I do not know whether it could be taken out of the Indian funds or whether it must be out of funds appropriated for the Indians.

Mr. RICH. Does this Indian tribe have any funds in the Treasury?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I think they have.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I do not know how much they have, but whatever it is, this purchase price should not be taken out of it.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman better get that information before action is taken on this bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been O. K'd by the Indian Bureau and endorsed by two government agencies of Arizona. We are trying to buy 600 acres of land to add to the San Carlos Indian Reservation. About 130 or 140 acres are tillable when under irrigation. This is another effort to make these Indians more nearly self-supporting. If they may have some farm land on which to raise grass, they will become self-sufficient, as they are expert stockmen. This purchase will facilitate the economic management of the San Carlos Reservation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all that, and I know that the Indian Bureau is interested. We say we are trying to make the Indians self-supporting; but if notice is taken of the legislation we have passed in the last 4 or 5 years in support of Indians, the amount of appropriation each year is

becoming greater and greater. It is supposed that the number of Indians is becoming less and less, but the cost of maintaining them is increasing. Every member of the Interior Department Appropriation Committee that has charge of the allocation of funds to the Indian Bureau knows this to be the case. I would like to know whether these funds are going to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States or out of the Indian tribe funds for the land. We ought to know that definitely before we decide on the passage of the bill. I think it should go over until the gentleman can get the information we are asking for.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS ADJACENT TO SAN JUAN NATIONAL FOREST, COLO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 8356, for the exchange of lands adjacent to the San Juan National Forest and the Rio Grande National Forest in Colorado.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. L. 465; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 485), entitled "An act to consolidate national forest lands," and the provisions of the act of February 28, 1925 (43 Stat. L. p. 1090; U. S. C., title 16, sec. 486), entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to consolidate national forest lands,'" and acts amendatory thereto, are hereby extended to include any suitable offered lands within the boundaries of that portion of the former Mexican grant known as the Tierra Amarilla Grant, lying within the State of Colorado, adjacent to the Rio Grande or San Juan National Forests. Lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become parts of the national forest nearest to which they are situated, and shall thereafter be subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to said national forest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION TO CITIZENSHIP OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 575, to consider the bill H. R. 6381, for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to February 5, 1917.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill provides for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came to this country prior to February 5. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LESINSKI. This bill provides that the people who are legally in this country, and who have entered prior to 1917, being in the main old people and unable to speak the language fully and correctly, may be allowed to become citizens without going through all the tests that are necessary now. In other words, they are not allowed citizenship unless they can read and write the English language.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 610 and the consideration of the bill H. R. 9047, to provide for the transfer of United States prisoners in certain cases.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any person confined in any penal or correctional institution pursuant to a judgment of conviction of an offense against the United States has been indicted or convicted of a felony in a court of record of any State, other than the State in which such person is confined, the Attorney General shall, if he finds it in the public interest to do so, upon the request of the Governor or the executive authority of such State, and upon the presentation of a certified copy of such indictment or judgment of conviction, cause such person to be transferred prior to

his release to a penal or correctional institution situated within such State that is authorized to receive United States prisoners. In the event more than one such request is presented in respect to any prisoner, the Attorney General shall determine in his discretion which request should receive preference. The expense of personnel and transportation incurred in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be chargeable to the appropriation for the "support of United States prisoners."

SEC. 2. The term "indictment" as used in this act shall include "information" and the term "indicted" shall include "informed against." The term "State" shall include the District of Columbia, but not Territories.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit the authority of the Attorney General to transfer any prisoners pursuant to any other provision of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the RECORD, and include a proclamation of the Governor of Texas and also a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members have asked me about H. R. 9047 on today's Consent Calendar, which was introduced by me, and have wanted to know the reasons and necessity therefor. This I am glad to explain.

H. R. 9047 is entitled "A bill to provide for the transfer of United States prisoners in certain cases." Since this bill is short and since the reading of the bill, I think, will enable one to understand its purpose and import, I quote the bill just here in full:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any person confined in any penal or correctional institution pursuant to a judgment of conviction of an offense against the United States has been indicted or convicted of a felony in a court of record of any State, other than the State in which such person is confined, the Attorney General shall, if he finds it in the public interest to do so, upon the request of the Governor or the executive authority of such State, and upon the presentation of a certified copy of such indictment or judgment of conviction, cause such person to be transferred prior to his release to a penal or correctional institution situated within such State that is authorized to receive United States prisoners. In the event more than one such request is presented in respect to any prisoner, the Attorney General shall determine in his discretion which request should receive preference. The expense of personnel and transportation incurred in carrying out the provisions of this act shall be chargeable to the appropriation for the "Support of United States prisoners."

SEC. 2. The term "indictment" as used in this act shall include "information" and the term "indicted" shall include "informed against." The term "State" shall include the District of Columbia, but not Territories.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit the authority of the Attorney General to transfer any prisoners pursuant to any other provision of law.

The purpose and workings of the bill might be further illustrated by brief reference to a case prosecuted by me while I was district attorney of the forty-sixth judicial district of Texas. In January of 1934 it was my unpleasant duty to prosecute a former sheriff and tax collector of Foard County, Tex. This sheriff was sent to the Texas penitentiary under convictions in three separate cases, two convictions carried penalties of 3 years each while a third carried a penalty of 7 years. On January 14, 1935, this ex-sheriff received a conditional pardon on his 7-year sentence, but not on his 3-year sentences, commitment papers on which had not been filed at the State penitentiary at Huntsville, Tex. Immediately on receipt of this conditional pardon said ex-sheriff went to New Orleans, La., and surrendered to Federal officers to begin the service of a sentence of 1 year and 1 day for conspiracy and counterfeiting, and on January 30, 1935, was committed to the United States penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga. On July 2, 1935, the aforesaid conditional pardon was revoked by the then Governor of Texas, the Honorable James V. Allred. The revocation proclamation of Governor Allred contains a further statement of facts, and the proclamation is here quoted in full:

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

To All To Whom These Presents Shall Come:

Whereas Que R. Miller, convict No. 75520, was convicted in the district court of Hardeman County, Tex., in January 1934, of misapplication of public funds, and sentenced to 7 (2-7) years' confinement in the State penitentiary; and was, on the 14th day of

January 1935, granted a conditional pardon by the then Governor in proclamation No. 27386; and

Whereas I have, as Governor, been requested to revoke the conditional pardon granted Que R. Miller in proclamation No. 27386. It has been represented to me by Hon. Ed L. Gossett, district attorney in and for the forty-sixth judicial district of Texas, as follows: "Said Miller in the procurement of said pardon perpetrated a fraud upon the Governor in failing to disclose: (1) That at the time said pardon was granted he was under final conviction for the misapplication of public funds in Foard County, Tex., the commitment papers for which were not then of record in the State penitentiary; (2) That at such time there was then pending (and is still pending) in the district court of Wilbarger County, Tex., an indictment against the said Miller for the misapplication of public funds; (3) That the said Miller had admitted the misapplication and conversion of public money while sheriff and tax collector of Foard County exceeding \$40,000; (4) That said Miller had been indicted in Foard County, Tex., in cause No. 516 on the docket of the district court for the fraudulent disposition of mortgaged property, which case had been dismissed after he had gone to the penitentiary; (5) That there had been filed on the 10th day of January 1935, and was then pending (and is still pending) in the district court of Johnson County, Tex., in cause No. 14994, an indictment against the said Que R. Miller for felony theft; (6) That on the 10th day of December 1933, in the district court of Jackson County, Okla., said Miller had been indicted for the offense of robbery with firearms under the alias of George Waggoner, said Waggoner and Miller being the same persons, which indictment is now pending; (7) That at the time such conditional pardon was granted that said Miller had pending against him in the district court of Shawnee, Okla., an indictment for robbing one Evans of \$2,000, and was under \$10,000 bond in such cause, which cause is still pending; (8) That the records of the Western Union office at Vernon then revealed that said Miller had received in nine telegraphic messages over \$38,000 from the tax collector of Wilbarger County, Tex., such wires dating from October 1931 to May 1932, and that the tax collector of Wilbarger County had admitted such money to have been public funds and such tax collector went to the Texas penitentiary for such misapplication but the said Miller was never indicted for this offense, it being the opinion of prosecuting officials that he would have to do the 7 years assessed him in Hardeman County, Tex.; (9) That at such time said Miller had pled guilty in the Federal court of New Orleans to the possession of counterfeit money for which crime he is now serving in the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., his time expiring on November 12, 1935. Furthermore, since the granting of said conditional pardon, said Miller has been twice indicted by the grand jury of Wilbarger County, Tex. The grand jury for the March term, 1935, indicted said Miller for the swindle of one B. A. Winter out of a diamond ring of the alleged value of \$1,000; the grand jury for the June term, 1935, indicted the said Miller for the swindling of one F. M. Johnson out of \$200, said swindle occurring on or about January 15, 1935, at the very time of or after said conditional pardon was granted." Because the said Que R. Miller has been twice indicted for felonies since the granting of the conditional pardon to him in proclamation No. 27386, because there is now pending against him in four different district courts at least six felony indictments, and because of the fraudulent representations and nondisclosures, and because Miller's entire record proves him to be a dangerous enemy of society, this request for a revocation of the conditional pardon granted the convict has been asked. The conditional pardon granted the said Que R. Miller stated that it was subject to revocation "for any good and sufficient reason" of the Governor's justifying his so doing * * * "with or without hearing * * *". Acting upon and because of the recommendation stated above: Now, therefore,

I, James V. Allred, Governor of the State of Texas, by virtue of the authority vested in me under the constitution and laws of this State, upon the recommendations hereinabove cited and for the reasons herein set out and now on file in the office of the Secretary of State, do hereby revoke the conditional pardon granted to Que R. Miller in proclamation No. 27386 by the then Governor on the 14th day of January 1935. The said conditional pardon is hereby set aside and declared void. The prison authorities are hereby instructed to take him in charge immediately upon his release from the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., and return him to the penitentiary to serve the remainder of his term.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto signed my name officially and caused the seal of State to be impressed hereon at Austin, this the 2d day of July, A. D., 1935.

[SEAL]

JAMES V. ALLRED,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:

GERALD C. MANN,
Secretary of State.

On the expiration of said ex-sheriff's term in the United States prison at Atlanta, on request from Texas officials, upon warrants from Texas courts, said Miller was taken into custody by the sheriff of Fulton County, Ga.

Gov. Eugene Talmadge, of Georgia, refused to surrender said ex-sheriff to Texas officers. Notwithstanding three unserved sentences in the Texas penitentiary, notwithstanding the numerous felony indictments pending in Texas against the said Que R. Miller, Governor Talmadge refused Governor

Allred's request for Miller's return and gave his reasons therefor in the following letter to Governor Allred:

DECEMBER 20, 1935.

HON. JAMES V. ALLRED,
Governor of Texas, Austin, Tex.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: The requisition for the extradition of Q. R. Miller, was presented to me today, and after going into the matter thoroughly, I have declined to grant the extradition.

It appears that Miller was given a conditional pardon by the Governor of Texas on January 14, 1935, that he immediately surrendered himself to the Federal authorities and was sent to the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga., and served a sentence of which he had been previously convicted.

He has completed the service of this sentence at the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta, Ga., and the request for his extradition is based on the fact that his conditional pardon was revoked on July 2, 1935.

It is apparent on its face that this man has not had an opportunity to commit a crime or to violate his conditional pardon, due to the fact that he has been incarcerated in the Federal penitentiary since it was granted.

Sworn testimony was given showing that the information given by the district attorney in his petition to you for revocation of the conditional pardon was on file with Governor Ferguson when she granted the conditional pardon. This being true, I cannot see how Miller could be guilty of fraud in securing his conditional pardon.

In view of these facts which appear on the face of this case, and from sworn testimony, I think the extradition should be denied, and have given the matter that direction.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

EUGENE TALMADGE, Governor.

Had H. R. 9047 been the law in 1935, Federal officers would have placed said Miller in a Federal prison in Texas prior to his release. Miller would have been released in his home State of Texas at little or no additional expense and there would have been no confusion or miscarriage of justice. H. R. 9047 is designed to plug this big hole in our defense against crime and to provide for better cooperation by the Federal Government with the States in the matter of law enforcement.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the consideration of bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein comments by Senator McNARY, Senator BARKLEY, and others.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks, including a letter from a member of the Oklahoma Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of March 25, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], in an extension of his remarks, made an attack on the Governor and Legislature of Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I want to do what little I can to destroy prejudice wherever it may raise its vicious head.

In his remarks unfounded assertion has been the gentleman's chief resort. There was a time when slander fulminated from the platform smote like a sword, but the supply having greatly exceeded the demand, political slander and misrepresentation has at last become almost innocent amusement.

Arguments cannot be answered by personal abuse. There is no logic in slander. Falsehood in the end defeats itself. The gentleman does not offer facts, he makes assertions. He does not say, "I think." He says, "I know." He does not appeal to reason, he calls on prejudice. It is amazing to me that a difference of opinion on a condition that he knows nothing with certainty about should lead the gentleman from Mississippi to accuse, persecute, and hate people he does not know. Does he denounce and slander every person who thinks for himself? Does he hold that every thought con-

trary to his own is conceived in falsehood and brought forth in fraud?

Slander has been used as a weapon for centuries against those who exercise the right to think for themselves. It is the same old hoot, hooted by screech owls for a thousand years. There is little democracy until there is mental grandeur enough to allow every man to have his thought and say without impugning his motives and slandering his actions. Is it now so that no two men can differ and still respect each other's motives and integrity? Is thought to become a slave and reason a trembling coward? Is independence a crime? Has cowardice become a virtue? In my opinion every mind should think, investigate, and conclude for itself the road to take. Every man should repel dictation and tyranny from whatever source it should come.

Particularly, the gentleman said:

A large number of influential members of that body (the State legislature), who occupy key positions, are on the pay rolls of the oil interests, coal interests, or power interests.

In addition to his malicious attack on the Governor of Oklahoma, the gentleman has seen fit to indict and condemn the State legislature. If the gentleman from Mississippi has any specific information of any wrong activity or any guilt on the part of any of these people whom he condemns, I am sure that the people of Oklahoma would like to have specific information, if the gentleman can base it upon substantiating facts. If he has no facts, he ought to say so. If his statements are based on hearsay, they are immediately open to suspicion.

Like the Congress of the United States, the Legislature of Oklahoma is an elected body, made up by and large, I am sure, of men of integrity. The gentleman's remarks about the Legislature of Oklahoma indicate with what amazing ingenuity a fragment of truth can be magnified, twisted, and distorted out of language.

I am not addressing myself to the right or wrong of any particular action of the Governor or the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma. I do not follow the details of their activities closely enough to pass judgment. I devote my time to trying to do a good job here. So far as my relations with the Governor and the members of the Legislature of Oklahoma are concerned, they attend to their affairs and I attend to mine. I do not meddle in State affairs, but I resent, for the State of Oklahoma, this false accusation against the elected officials of my State.

The charge that any great number of influential members of the State Legislature of Oklahoma are on the pay roll of special interests is unreasonable, untrue, and malicious. I hold these charges in infinite contempt.

I do not believe the gentleman ever set foot in Oklahoma or ever spent a day in Oklahoma in his life, so how can he know the facts involved? I can assure the gentleman that Oklahoma is filled with men of character and intelligence. Men and women capable of governing themselves without assistance from the gentleman from Mississippi.

The State of Mississippi, with all of its fine and splendid people, is not free from suffering and want, and I expect that in the State of Mississippi industry is crippled, labor is robbed, and the poor are burdened with taxation. While we realize that the gentleman's mental hemorrhage in which he slandered the Governor and Legislature of Oklahoma was born out of a feeling of knight errantry, we feel that his knighthood would best be in flower championing the cause of labor in Mississippi, promoting the health and welfare of the farmers of Mississippi and abolishing the specter of hunger, want, and insecurity from within the boundaries of his State.

I do not assert that every action of the Governor and Legislature of Oklahoma has been in every way correct. I have no doubt but that there have been errors of judgment. I am certain that in the main the Oklahoma Legislature is filled with men of wisdom, integrity, and good character.

I have no information which would lead me to pass judgment on the action of the Governor of Oklahoma at the Grand River Dam, so I do not approve or condemn it. I feel that

those questions are up to the people of Oklahoma and not for me to decide, and certainly not to be settled by the gentleman from Mississippi.

It is an unpleasant and unwanted duty to come in conflict with a colleague, but the gentleman's broad indictment is unjust and unfair. He has not supported with evidence and fact a single assertion that he has made.

Representing my district with the concurrent broader responsibilities has absorbed all of my time, and so I repeat, in conclusion, that I have had neither the time nor the inclination even to observe closely the activities of the Governors or the legislatures of the various States. I do not try to decide what they should do with the problems which they must face and meet. I have enough to do to decide what should be done with problems we must meet and solve here. I would not presume to try to tell the Governor or Legislature of Oklahoma or of any other State what to do, just as I would not permit them to tell me what to do in any given circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise here to defend the action of the Governor or any particular member of the Oklahoma Legislature in any particular circumstance or matter, but I do defend the Governor of Oklahoma as a man of character and the legislature of my State as a body of honorable men. The finest thing about a democracy is that every action is its own defense and lives only the length of its value. If an action is right it will live and grow forever. If it is wrong it will break down of its own weight and die in its own error. Mr. Speaker, I arose to denounce and condemn an unjust and unwarranted attack upon my State and the elected officials of my State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
March 29, 1940.

HON. LYLE H. BOREN, M. C.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SR: I have noticed in the newspapers that an attack has been made upon the Governor of our State in regard to his partiality to utilities and also as to his record when a member of the house of representatives. I feel that this is a reflection upon the record that I have written as a member of the house of representatives. Certainly it behooves me to protect my record and that of the Governor also.

For your information and that of the gentlemen who made this attack, I have gone through all the legislative journals since 1933, the beginning of Governor Phillips' career in public office, and have checked the recorded votes affecting utilities. Not one time do I find where he has cast a vote in support of legislation favoring the utilities and public-service corporations of this State.

It might be well to here set out and enumerate the bills that were introduced and passed by the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth sessions of the Oklahoma Legislature, of which Governor Phillips was a member. Beginning with the fourteenth legislature in 1933, Governor Phillips voted "aye" on house bill No. 1, which was an act levying a tax upon the net incomes of utilities and public-service corporations. I find that he voted "aye" on house bill No. 225, which levied a tax upon freight rates against railroads. He voted "aye" on house bill No. 650, levying a corporation license tax. He was the author of house bill No. 675, which proposed to create a revolving fund of \$100,000 to investigate and assemble facts in regard to the public utilities' rate—this fund to be collected from the utilities doing business in this State.

During the fifteenth session of the Oklahoma Legislature, in 1935, Phillips was speaker of the house of representatives. He changed the basic rates of income tax which vitally affected the utilities of this State. The old law provided for a 2-percent to 5-percent tax on a graduated scale. He passed the bill, broadening it from 1 percent to 6 percent, which nearly doubled the tax on utilities. House bill No. 87, known as the gross production tax bill, passed the house in that session, increasing the gross-production tax from 3 percent to 8 percent. That more than doubled the tax. During the fifteenth session Phillips initiated a program and set up a balanced budget, which this State had not enjoyed for 8 years previous. It also created a surplus of about \$1,000,000. Nobody else can take credit for that except our Governor.

In the sixteenth legislature, beginning in 1937, Governor Phillips voted for and supported a bill which created the Grand River Dam authority. He also voted for the passage of house bill No. 94, which limited the length of trains. The railroads put on a lobby during that session attempting to defeat this bill which has never been surpassed. House bill No. 349, charging a franchise tax on public utilities that operated in this State, was passed by Governor Phillips' untiring efforts.

During his administration as Governor he has done away with the ports of entry, which were a trade barrier limiting the trucking industry from competition and giving the people a disadvantage in freight rates in the State of Oklahoma with surrounding States.

As Governor he ordered his attorneys in the tax commission to collect a use tax against the Stanolind Pipe Line Co. and the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. These companies had paid this tax and later filed a suit in the Federal courts to recover the amount of revenue that they had paid in. This case has been heard and decided in favor of the companies and, upon the Governor's instructions, appealed to the circuit court of appeals and is set for oral argument on April 16 of this year.

All during his tenure in public office not one place can I find a bill showing favoritism to the utilities. I had the pleasure of serving 4 years in the house of representatives with Governor Phillips. I served in the last session, under his administration, as a representative from Lincoln County. I am rather proud of the record I have made and I am more than proud of the record that Governor Phillips has made in the past and is making at the present time as Governor of this Commonwealth.

Certainly, bearing in mind Governor Phillips' legislative record and his record as our chief executive, no one familiar with these facts could charge him with favoring utilities or public-service corporations.

I have made a thorough check of his record and I am giving it to you to do with as you please. You may use it to enlighten others who have made these accusations or to acquaint yourself with his record.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER D. HOYT,
State Representative, Lincoln County.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted today with a critical situation, to which reference has already been made in the House this afternoon, but it can hardly be understood except against the background of the general economic problem which we face.

I take it that all of us are eager to solve the unemployment problem. But we do not want just to solve the unemployment problem. We want to do more than that. We want to solve the unemployment problem within the framework of a free economic system and with the preservation of our constitutional democracy as a form of government. This presents us with a more difficult task than might otherwise be the case. That task is worth doing with all our might, for the future of human liberty depends upon our accomplishing it.

The problem in a nutshell is largely a matter of 2 plus 2 having to equal 4. Industry and agriculture turn out goods each year of a certain value and price. The total selling price of all these goods is equal to the realized income of the people of the United States, but unless that income is promptly either spent on consumers' goods or invested in new capital goods you have a shortage of buying power, and a part of those goods cannot be sold.

Under these circumstances one of three things must happen: Either Congress without resort to public debt has to exercise its constitutional prerogative and actually create money and place it into circulation through the hands of people who will spend it promptly to an amount sufficient to compensate for that shortage of buying power, or else it must do things which will directly stimulate the prompt investment of idle savings, or else Government must in some manner itself spend sufficient funds to compensate for the shortage of buying power relative to the value of goods and services produced. The last method is the one used over the past 7 years. But it has been used intermittently and at times on an insufficient scale to bring the desired results. And once the money has been spent we have had no adequate means of keeping it in active circulation.

Unless these things are done and if investment is not promptly made of that section of realized income which goes into the hands of the people who normally will save or invest it, then you have unemployment and depression.

OUR CONDITION TODAY IS WHOLLY DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF THE TWENTIES

I know that in what I am going to say here today I shall be confronted before I get through with someone saying, "Why not go back to what we did in the twenties? We seemed to get along all right in those days. Why not go back and follow along that same policy?" I am going to answer that at this time before I get started on the rest of my remarks.

In the first place, we did not get along all right in the twenties. The reason we did not get along all right was because all through the twenties we were laying the groundwork for the most terrible depression in all the history of this country; namely, the depression of 1929. The collapse of that year was caused by maladjustments which had been accumulating all through the previous 9 years.

The second point is that during the twenties you had four different things that were taking place which constituted avenues of compensation for the failure of savings to go promptly into investment. The first of these was a net increase in the debts of local governments; that is, States and municipalities, of about \$1,000,000,000 a year. This money was mostly spent on local public improvements and public works. This net expansion of local-government debt, totaling about \$9,000,000,000 during the twenties up to 1929, continued until approximately the year 1933, when it started to level off. The debt of local public bodies is now slightly on the decline.

In the second place, the consumers of America had accumulated a total consumers' indebtedness by 1929 of somewhere between \$9,000,000,000 and \$11,000,000,000. They owed that much for goods bought on the installment plan; that is, they had attempted to purchase some \$11,000,000,000 more of goods and services than they had the income to pay for, and had taken those goods off the shelves but never, in fact, were able to pay for them.

In the next place, a lot of foreign bonds were sold, which means there was a lot of money loaned to foreign countries, money that never was paid back but which for the time being constituted a market for goods. In other words, America was able to work like the very devil in order to create a lot of valuable goods to send abroad and not get paid for them, but it did create employment temporarily and a distribution of buying power.

Now, let me show you a couple of charts. I hold in my hand a chart of family dwelling construction. This is 1932, and this is 1939. It shows a steady increase during those years. Look at the difference, however, between the twenties and the thirties. There is where a lot of money now in idle savings went in the twenties. This is the value of building construction, telling the same story. I could go on and show you other examples of the same thing.

We are not in a period comparable to the twenties, Mr. Speaker; we are in a new period which is marked more than anything else by one characteristic; namely, a sharp increase in the output and efficiency per worker both in agriculture and in industry. We can produce more with fewer people employed. But we cannot continue to produce unless pretty much everyone is able to consume his share of national output. We are under the absolute necessity of seeing to it that the standard of living of the American Nation rises in proportion to its power to produce wealth. For good or ill, and I would say on the whole for good, we are not at the moment making a lot of foreign loans, not in anything like the volume they were being made in the twenties.

We cannot simply stop all our governmental efforts and turn this thing loose, because there just simply is not room for enough investment to absorb the funds which now seek investment. Our distribution of income is so heavily weighted in favor of the top one-third of our population that they cannot find places to invest promptly the 20 percent of the total national income which, in a year like 1937, they will save. We save about 20 percent or at any rate 15 percent of our national income. On the basis of a national income of even \$80,000,000,000 we would have to find investment opportunity for about \$19,000,000,000, and it just cannot be done. We just do not need \$19,000,000,000 of new capital goods each year. That amount of money is half the value of all the factories in America. There has got to be more money in the stream of consumer buying power and less in the pools of idle savings in order to enable the remainder of investment funds to be promptly put to work.

Every time a new machine is invented, moreover, we need an additional volume of consumer buying power in circulation to match this increased production. At present we depend on an increase in either public or private debt to get this expansion of our money supply. We should not be in that position when our Nation's power to produce increases; then is the time when our money supply should be increased by direct action of Congress creating that money. We should not, as a Nation, go into debt to the banking system when we need a net addition to consumer buying power to match an increase in production. But to get back to our comparison of the present day with the 1920's.

State and local debt has stopped increasing, and consumers on the whole are not able to expand their debt as they did during the twenties. We find ourselves, therefore, in the position where, unless some other salutary measures are taken, such as a program of taxes and pensions to our older citizens which would, in effect, shift a portion of funds that now seek investment over into active consumer buying power—in the absence of taking that step, in the absence of establishing a truly scientific monetary system which would bring money into circulation in accordance with national needs and not in accordance with purely fortuitous circumstances of a group of people being willing to borrow at interest from the banking system, and the banks being likewise ready to lend, in the absence of taking some of these steps, in the absence of making a constructive use of some of the gold and silver resources that now lie idle in the Federal Treasury as a credit base for a public-works program which might be run on the basis of as little as 1 percent interest, in the absence of doing those things, we are confronted with the necessity that the Federal Government has got to compensate for the failure of investment to be promptly made or else you go deeper into depression, and unemployment continues.

Since last December 1939 the Federal Reserve index of production has declined from 128 points to 104 for the month of March. The rate of decline is just about as sharp as it was in the latter part of 1937.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It has been suggested that we must resort again to increasing our imports and commence to lend again to foreign nations to bring us out of the condition we are in. What has the gentleman to say about that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has this to say about it. I am in favor of foreign trade as a means of mutual benefit to two nations, one of which can produce certain commodities and the other other commodities so that there is benefit by mutual interchange of needed goods. But I believe it is a confession of failure on our own part when we find it necessary to rely upon shipping valuable commodities out of our country in order to distribute wages to our own people because of those exports instead of being able to bring about a better standard of living for our own people here at home. And I would remind the gentleman of the very remarkable speech made by Mr. Milo Perkins, in Des Moines, Iowa, in which he pointed out that so far as the farmers of America are concerned, their greatest possibility of an expanded market lies in enabling the poorest two-thirds of the American people to buy the food they really need.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to say that the gentleman is making a very splendid, convincing, and elaborate argument and I agree with every word he says, but the gentleman would oppose, would he not, the further lending of money to foreign countries until we have put our own country on its feet?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact, though, that the gentleman would welcome loans to foreign countries that are good loans, properly secured, if they are secured and the gentleman feels reasonably certain they would be paid back. That kind of foreign trade the gentleman would be in favor of.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is quite a different matter, I will say to the gentleman.

I would like to proceed now, if I may for a few moments without interruption, because I want to get on with my statement.

YEARS 1937 AND 1940 COMPARED

In the year 1937, the Congress was confronted by a decision very similar to the one that it confronts today. In the closing months of 1936 we found an increase in employment. Here is a chart that shows it. Here is 1933, and employment went up through about the middle of 1937 and got above 100, which was the average for 1923 to 1925. At that point we said, "Ah, now we must balance the Budget. Now we almost have gotten the best of this thing, so now is the time to quit." This short-sighted policy, together with another factor that came into the picture at that time—the Social Security Act—caused a sharp decline. I think I can explain that better by saying that manufacturers and producers of goods ordinarily accumulate a certain quantity of inventory. If their inventory becomes a considerable one and if they must look forward to a sharp curtailment of mass buying power on the part of the people, they just let those inventories run off, shut down their plants, and curtail employment. They do not do this to be mean; they do it because they have to. Therefore, when in 1937 it became apparent that not only was it contemplated that W. P. A. employment would be sharply curtailed, but that P. W. A. was to be shut down, and also that there would be a serious deflationary influence from the operation of the Social Security Act, you then had a sharp decline in employment in private industry in 1937. Now, if you will observe the curve at the end of this chart, you will find that the same tendency is indicated for the beginning of 1940, and indeed, between December 1939 and February 1940, employment did decline, according to the Department of Labor, by 1,160,000, part of which, of course, was a seasonal decline. Our main job, however, is to halt that decline now. We can do it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman remember another factor that he did not mention—the time the curve started down and the country went into a tail spin? Just before that the reserve requirements of the banks were doubled, which was the same as plowing under three or four billion dollars. It was lost.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; and I think also at that time there were other policies that might have been pursued with good effect by the Federal Reserve Board, that were not used. I would point out generally that inflation can never take place so long as increases in monetary supply or velocity are matched by corresponding increases in the production of goods and services.

As far as inventories at the moment are concerned, we find the manufacturing inventories in February at 110.5, compared to 100 for December 1938, and 12 points higher than last June. Wholesale inventories in February were at 118 points, compared to December 1938. If businessmen must look ahead to the Federal Government firing 1,400,000 W. P. A. workers between now and October—I will explain that statement later on—do you think they would maintain these inventories or would they let them run off and cut down production and lay off men? Anybody who can think about it will know. As a matter of fact, since December there has been a net decline in private employment of over 1,000,000 men. I do not know exactly how many, but some people estimate it at a million and a half. Orders on file have declined. Here is a chart that shows that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. These charts are mostly for heavy-goods industries. I will yield in a moment. We have no P. W. A. program in operation at the moment, though we ought to have, and my speech today would be different if we did have one. We could have one without any particular burden, without 1 cent of burden on the Budget. We could have a program offering loans at 1 percent to public bodies for public works—for schools, hospitals, and the like. We could have that if the Federal Government stopped hoarding some \$4,000,000,000 of money, which it is not using today. There is \$1,600,000,000 of idle silver seignorage in the Treasury. There is the \$2,000,000,000 stabilization fund, of which only \$200,000,000 has ever been used. Assuming that \$500,000,000 were left in the stabilization fund, that is a total of \$3,100,000,000 which might readily be used as a credit base. In addition, there is \$280,000,000 of completely idle gold, to say nothing of the Government gold against which the Federal Reserve banks have been given gold-certificate credits, and a working balance of over a billion dollars in the Treasury. It seems to me that we might make use of some of the monetary resources. The people have paid for them; why not use them for the people's benefit?

I would not be speaking as I am today except that we have failed to pass legislation that would have given us a monetary system readily responsive to the Nation's needs; we have gone along with a seriously deflationary social-security program, seeking to build up a huge reserve instead of passing a national pension system that would operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, paying out promptly all the tax money it takes in.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman brought out an interesting point the other day, and I hope that he develops it more fully now, as to how much of this money in the Treasury could be used. There is a general fund and a stabilization fund, and I believe it was shown that there were about \$3,000,000,000 hoarded in the Treasury that could be used now for W. P. A. or anything else of that kind.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it is at least that much. There is \$1,642,000,000, approximately, of silver seignorage against which there has been no currency issued, and in the stabilization fund there is a total of \$2,000,000,000, of which only \$200,000,000 has ever been used. A billion and a half might readily be used for constructive purposes. There is also nearly \$300,000,000, I believe, of completely free gold, and, as the gentleman suggests, a very large working balance of, I believe, over \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman think it is better to restore prosperity to our own people than to stabilize the currency of foreign countries?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do; and at this present moment we might have a long-range program of public works, that might be set up on a basis of approved projects, which might be available at the time of unemployment, so that men could be put to work when necessary, so that we would have it on a stable basis. We have the monetary reserve to do that. That is only one part of the answer I would like to make to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The program we are following is extremely deflationary.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is, in my opinion.

Mr. RANKIN. We are borrowing money from the rich and giving it to the poor, for the rest of the American people to give back with compound interest. That not only kills initiative, but it also depresses prices. We demonetize silver and demonetize gold. We have our gold buried in the ground and our silver almost in the same condition. If we would remonetize both gold and silver on a ratio of something like 15 or 16 to 1 and issue currency against this gold and put it in circulation, it would remonetize silver all over the world and start foreign nations which are not at war to trading with us. That would restore farm commodity prices almost overnight and would break this deadlock. Then men would find their own jobs. They would go back to their own farms

and their own homes and not be seeking the relief rolls. Until we do that, we might as well understand that we are going to be in this log jam that we are in today, and public spending will continue.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi very much. Now, speaking of deflationary influences, I would just like to point out—I know the reasons for it and why it is done and everything else, but the fact remains that in the current year of 1940 the social-security system will tax away from the people \$1,200,000,000 more than will be paid out in benefits. That is for the purpose of building up a reserve; but the point is that unless that \$1,200,000,000 is compensated for some way by additional spending on the part of the Government, which amount must, under our present monetary system, be borrowed, then you have got into a deflationary influence there that is most serious from the standpoint of our need for a proper balance between the consumer buying power and the power to produce. That is the reason why I believe, frankly, we should have a national system of pensions based upon the kind of taxes that will reduce the total volume of now idle money.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman develop the unemployment-insurance taxation? Would you have another system of raising the money for that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would raise the benefits first of all. But the difficulty is that only the States can take that action. I personally believe, also, that there is too much money being set aside for administration. I cannot understand why 10 percent is necessary, but I am a layman on that and I do not know for certain about that, and perhaps I should not say anything about it. But in general I would say that the benefits from unemployment insurance should be raised. That is a State matter, however.

Mr. PATMAN. I mean the taxes; the tax to raise that money. Would you adopt another method for raising the money or would you continue the one we have now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the tax on pay rolls for unemployment insurance, as well as old-age insurance, is essentially a deflationary tax. As a matter of fact, we are taxing pay rolls and spending the money on general Government expenses. Sound tax policy would indicate an opposite system.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But on unemployment insurance I would say this, in general: I think that at the moment the most important thing would be for the States to raise the benefits, because many a man is worse off because he gets it than if he did not get it, because it makes him ineligible for other work programs. We cannot correct that, but the States can correct it.

On the matter of old-age pensions, we should have a different form of taxation, and one which would meet this central problem I am talking about, namely, the unbalance between consumer buying power, on the one hand, and production on the other—the inability of our people to buy what can so easily be produced.

W. P. A. ONLY AGENCY NOW AVAILABLE

One agency remains today which we can use to do the immediate job of starting employment on the upward road again. Here is the chart of industrial production for 1937 and for 1940. In both years a drop in employment shows the same proposition—sloughing off there and sloughing off here. We have one agency that can be used to check this tendency before it becomes serious, as it did in 1937, and that is the W. P. A. Yet here is what we plan to do.

I come to you with a brief today not only for those W. P. A. families, hundreds of whom I know, who are good people, people who only want to keep their kids in school, who only want to work for a living instead of being on relief or the dole. People talk about this being a dole program. It is not a dole program. It is an opportunity for people to earn a living instead of being put on the dole. I come to you not only with a brief for that group of people, but with a brief

for the whole economic system of this country at this moment. I come to you with an appeal to keep these people working in order to stiffen consumer demand. If we wait longer, we will be hearing speeches about how "hunger is not debatable," and we will be passing an emergency bill to feed people when it is too late, and it will cost us a lot more money after we get through than if we act now.

In 1937 we waited, and in 1938 we came in with something like a \$4,000,000,000 program. The time to cut these programs is when these people actually go back to work in private industry and not when somebody thinks maybe they are going to go back. How many of us know what this schedule of cuts on W. P. A. contemplates? It contemplates the following: 200,000 off in April; 300,000 off in May; 200,000 off in June. That is the end of this fiscal year. Seven hundred thousand heads of families to be laid off at a time when private employment is declining and not increasing.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT FISCAL YEAR

We must put people to work, for private industry is not taking up the slack. If we are to have a sound program, we had better increase those rolls and not cut them down. At least we must keep them where they are. And now let us look ahead. The figure of the Budget for next year, \$1,000,000,000 for W. P. A. next year, would employ only 1,350,000 as against an average of 2,000,000 for this year. It means an average cut of 650,000.

Now, unless we keep up the employment for the balance of this year, there will be only a million and a half employed at the end of this coming June, and if the \$1,000,000,000 Budget figure for next year is not changed, W. P. A. will have to cut another 600,000 or 700,000 off between June 30 and the trough of employment in the late summer in order to have any expansion of the rolls possible in the coming winter. What we are really contemplating, unless this picture is changed by Congress, is a reduction of the W. P. A. employees by 1,400,000 between now and the end of the summer. We cannot do this thing, Mr. Speaker.

WHERE WILL THE MONEY COME FROM?

Certainly the least we can do is to prevent the laying off of one single person between now and the end of the fiscal year. To do this will cost \$86,800,000. That is all it will cost us, but where are we going to get the money? I will tell you about that.

Mr. RANKIN. I would get the money.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. RANKIN. I would issue it against this gold.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman for the contribution, and I am not in disagreement with him, I will say that; but I want to show that there is more than one way of doing it and no excuse for not doing it. I will tell you various ways it could be done. I have already introduced a bill to do it. It would be this. There are some industries that have benefited very greatly from the war situation—a few, not very many, but a few. Agriculture has been hurt, fruit and vegetables have been hurt, tobacco has been hurt, even wheat has been hurt, and other peacetime industries. I think it is fair for us to levy a special tax on war excess profits in order that the burden of raising this revenue should be better distributed as between those who benefit from wartime profits and those who are hurt by war. That bill would provide some relief. In other words, I just want to say that I am not afraid to take my medicine on the tax side of this thing if it is necessary.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Very briefly, but I have not much time left.

Mr. PATRICK. Would it not be tremendously difficult, if not almost impossible, to determine who was hurt and who was not hurt, between ordinary profits and excess profits?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not if we would follow this bill and say we would take normal profits as profits made in a base period of 4 or 5 years. A base period would be fixed in which normal profits would be determined. The tax would

not apply say to any profits below 5 percent, 6 percent, or 7 percent, in any case, and it would fall only on the increase over and above normal profits of corporations. Another way of getting the money, however, is this hoarded money in the Treasury that we spoke about awhile ago. Another way is that current tax revenues according to the best estimate that we can get hold of are going to run about \$400,000,000 ahead of the original estimates. The \$86,000,000 required to carry the W. P. A. rolls along at their present strength would be less than one-quarter of the estimated increase of revenue derived from income-tax sources and from customs. No; if Congress permits these lay-offs, it cannot give the excuse that it did not have the money.

Over a period of time we have run on the basis of employing about 25 percent of the unemployed on W. P. A. I read in the morning's paper that the A. F. of L. estimates the unemployed at the present time at about 10,500,000, if my memory serves me correctly. According to the basis that we have followed in the past, that would mean over 2,500,000 people on W. P. A. As a matter of fact, we have about 2,300,000. And we are planning to cut it down to 900,000 before next fall.

WE NEED A CONSISTENT POLICY

I think I have made my position abundantly clear. I want to look at this thing fundamentally. I do not want the Congress to continually find itself in a position where it must suddenly decide that we have got to expand W. P. A., or having done so for a period, then to decide again all of a sudden that we have got to cut it down. What I am anxious to do is to get to the bottom of the fundamental problem, the fundamental reasons why we have this unemployment problem and try to work in a way that will result in a well-reasoned program that will be a permanent answer to it.

So I do not believe that any of us, regardless of what his political opinion may be, can afford to lay off these 1,400,000 American heads of families. I do not think we would be doing a fair thing by the businessmen, by the farmers, by those W. P. A. workers, by any other workers, or anybody else; and I ask you, therefore, to maintain these rolls where they are now for the balance of this fiscal year. Meanwhile we must find out once for all what is the real cause of unemployment, how we should act on taxes, old-age pensions, agriculture, public works, and many other matters to help solve it. Let us analyze the effect of the social-security program and see how different would be the effect of a national pension system paying out as it took in and operating to shift money out of idle pools into active consumers' hands. Let us think through this central problem of money and exchange and see whether it is not after all reasonable to say that if we have so-called surplus-farm commodities already piled up and several million people who need to eat them, that after all it would be right, it would be just, and it would be fair, particularly since those farm commodities sell today for a price below what is fair and below what is parity, to use the constitutional right of Congress to put sufficient money into circulation to enable those farm commodities to be moved. Such an expansive policy to be followed until such time and only until such time as farm prices are restored to a parity basis.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the local responsibility that ought to be assumed in the administration of the W. P. A.? I have in mind that in many of the States throughout the country the Federal Government ratio of expenditure for direct relief runs from 95 to 99 percent of the total cost. I have further in mind the fact that in many, many States of the Union they spend less money for direct relief even than some cities in my own State. What has the gentleman to say about that?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say in the first place that what the gentleman says does not hold true in my State.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is true.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. We have perhaps taken care over a period of time of approximately as many employable unemployed through State funds as were on W. P. A. There are other States where this has not been done, but I am told that if the rate of taxation in general in the State of Ohio,

for example, were as high as the rate of taxation in the State of Mississippi, the State of Ohio could raise four times the revenue that it is raising now. What I mean is this: One reason why some of the States do not pay more is because there is not the wealth to tax. For my part I believe that for the welfare of the United States as a whole, and certainly for the welfare of my own State, one of the biggest jobs is to get a better spread of prosperity throughout this Nation.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman thinks that in a State where there is no income tax there is an inability to pay? Does he believe where there is widespread real-estate exemptions there is an inability to pay? Does he believe where industrial conditions have consistently improved during the last 10 years there is an inability to pay?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not necessarily.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That exists in many States of the Union.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman may be right. And now in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recite just a bit of history.

In 1937, on May 20, I said this in the House:

The President has stated the thing most necessary for continued recovery and betterment is consumer purchasing power. I predict that if this Congress appropriates a billion or a billion and a half dollars, either one, but fails to appropriate more than either of these figures, we will be laying the ground work for the next depression. Not a penny less than \$2,200,000,000 must be appropriated to keep W. P. A. employment where it is now, and if you want money for P. W. A., the amount ought to be \$2,500,000,000.

We did not appropriate \$2,200,000,000. We appropriated \$1,500,000,000, and a few months later the recession began.

This year, on January 24, I said in the House:

No. I am frank to say that I believe that, under present circumstances, unless some of the things are done which I am going to talk about right now, it is necessary to keep up employment of our people—on public works, if necessary—to at least the degree it was last year. I would keep every young person in America busy. Therefore I do not agree with the Budget. I think it is altogether possible that if we make these drastic cuts we will have another decline like we did in 1937, with the consequent necessity of spending more money in the end than if at this moment we seized unemployment by the scruff of the neck and said: "We are going to do the job that has to be done. We are going to actually put to work American people who are not at work."

I have asked this time to repeat that warning.

If you do not like W. P. A. let us find a better method of dealing with this problem. I have said and I believe there are better methods.

But until those other methods are actually in operation we have no right to deny a minimum of life and decency to 1,400,000 American families in the next few months—no right to cut W. P. A. employment from 2,300,000 to 900,000 in about 7 short months. And that is what the present schedule calls for.

Either you must join with us in our conference on unemployment and help the 70 members who are working through it to develop the fundamental answer to unemployment or else—ladies and gentlemen of the House—you must change that schedule and find the money to provide more jobs for these unemployed people who have already over a 10-year period paid a very very heavy price for the failure of us here in Washington to solve the unemployment problem more quickly.

America has never lost a battle yet. She is not going to lose this one now. There will arise, I firmly believe, a new consecration among us, a new devotion to duty and to our country and to every last person in it. The difference between right and wrong will become more clear and here and there throughout the land will arise men of vision who will begin to say with conviction, "This way is the will of God for America."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Association of Real Estate Brokers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAWKS]?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all indebted to the gentleman from California for his efforts to produce a solution for our problem of unemployment, as, indeed, we are to everyone else in the House of Representatives who is working on this problem. I am sure we all recognize it as the gravest problem which confronts the Nation today—a problem the magnitude of which makes it necessary that we get down to hard and fast fundamental facts and devise some common-sense method of coping with this problem.

We have had it with us now for some 10 years, and it is now time that we should be able to profit by the experience we have had—collect our many ideas together, dispense with all hysteria and sentimentalism, and get down and work out some practical solution. When I think of the billions of dollars we have spent in the last 7 or 8 years on W. P. A., and think that all of this money has left almost nothing permanent behind it, I feel very much discouraged. When I make this statement I mean that we have spent all this money and indulged in all of this expenditure, but we have not devised any system whatsoever to make those who are unemployed or on W. P. A. any more able to care for themselves than they were before we spent this money. Very little of it has been spent for any real, permanent good.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to solve the problem of unemployment, we must solve it in some manner that does not fasten the unemployed on the public pay roll for their existence. We cannot forever continue to take money from those who have and give it to those who have not. Soon we will have only the have-nots. I believe we must go into the homes of the unemployed in the United States and make an estimate of the capabilities to be found there. We will find there a certain percentage of unemployed people who came from the farms. Certainly some means should be devised to return those people to a piece of land whereby they will be enabled to raise at least a part of their livelihood in the way of food. I recognize quite well that it is impossible to do this with all of the unemployed. Many people have said they should all be put back on the farms, but such a blanket movement would be no solution. There are a certain number of these unemployed who originally came from farms, and they can get along on the farms if they are put back there. They can raise enough to eat, or at least a good portion of what they will need to eat. The money used to put them back there would not be money thrown away. It would have a permanent and beneficial effect. On the other hand, there is a certain class of these people who, if put back on the farm, would have to have a high-priced expert with every family to prevent them from starving to death on the farm. Obviously, their return to the farm would be poor economy, and some other solution must be worked out in their case. To start with those who came from the farm would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am deeply interested in what the gentleman says, and I am with him. I wonder if he would include a reclamation program as a part of the thing he is suggesting, and I wonder what he would think about our approaching this problem of soil conservation in perhaps a more vigorous way than we have, with the possibility of enabling some of these people to go to work on soil

conservation in some sections of the country with a view to improving the land that they might themselves go onto.

Mr. FADDIS. In answer to the gentleman's question, I would be willing to go along on a proposition of that kind if it were undertaken on a hard and fast common-sense basis and not from the viewpoint of putting these people indefinitely on the public pay rolls, working around with soil until they wore it out. In other words, if the program would include putting them on a piece of land where they could raise their own living in the meantime, and then, in order to give them extra cash for clothing, amusement, and incidentals, let them work on soil conservation, all right; but if the program was purely a matter of putting these people on the public pay roll to work at soil conservation, no. That would be worse than the present program.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I believe the gentleman is right. May I ask one more question? I should like to know what the gentleman's opinion is of the Wheeler-Jones farm credit bill in this connection, and what his opinion is of the bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] relating to farm homesteads?

Mr. FADDIS. That would be almost too much to answer at the present time, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am in thorough sympathy with what the gentleman is saying. I have felt for some time—as a matter of fact, for the last 5 or 6 years—that if we had taken the money we have spent without bringing about any permanent benefits and had acquired farms around the centers of population, dividing the farms into 5-acre tracts, where the people could keep a cow, maybe a pig or two, and a few chickens, and raise some potatoes, and be partially self-sustaining, they could always get part-time labor in the towns. It happens that I come from a community where we have a large granite industry, and that is part-time work. The men are not employed the year around. If these granite cutters lived on such 5-acre tracts, with what they earn in the granite sheds and the quarries they would be living on top of the world and, as far as they are concerned, relief would be solved for all eternity.

Mr. FADDIS. I agree with the distinguished gentleman, and that is exactly what I should like to see started. For instance, let me use a personal illustration in saying that you can put some of these people back on the farm and others you cannot. Take myself, for instance. I was raised on a farm. If I had to go back to the farm and the cow got hide-bound I would know what was the matter with her. If the chickens got the roup, I would know what to do. If the cutworms were after the corn, I would know what was the matter and have an idea of what to do. But there are other people who, if you would put them on a piece of land of that kind, would be utterly and helplessly lost. You would have to provide entirely too much assistance to people of that kind to enable them to get along well on a piece of land to make the matter practical. Therefore, before any system of that kind could be put into effect, it would be necessary to make a thorough inventory of the unemployed and classify them in order to determine just where you could put them so they could help themselves.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. I notice in discussing the relief problem here on the floor that many Members labor under the impression that everybody would go back on the farm. I know people who would rather live in town on half rations than go out and work on a farm at full rations, because their inclination is not that way. However, if you would locate them on the outskirts of a town, where they could walk in and see a movie in the evening, or perhaps visit with friends in town, they would not feel that they were isolated far out in the country. This is a very important angle that is often overlooked. We are not all alike. Many of us would not like to go out on a farm, and would not be happy out there. They would feel they were cut off from everything. Yet

they would be thoroughly happy on a small tract of land which they could work by hand in the evenings and in their spare time.

Mr. FADDIS. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota that he is talking back in the "fallow candle" days. We now have rural electrification. We are taking cheap electricity out to the farmers of this country, and providing them with every convenience that you have in the towns without the noise and the taxes and other adverse influences from which they would like to get away. Consequently, there are more people moving back to the farm now. The inclination to move back to the farm or out to the rural sections is today stronger than it has ever been in the history of the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one brief observation?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that there are a great many people who, if you took them away from the noise, would feel they were out of everything. They would miss it.

Mr. RANKIN. We take them the noise over the radio.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] in his address a moment ago made the statement that the total national income either had to be spent on consumers' goods or invested in capital goods, or the amount withheld measured the amount of goods not purchased, which resulted in ultimate unemployment. Is not our problem here to determine why vast sums are not being invested in capital goods?

Mr. FADDIS. That is true. Capital goods are the goods that really create the employment with which we wish to take up the slack.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Exactly; and these superficial panaceas, such as pump priming, will never get to the root of the evil.

Mr. FADDIS. That is true, and if the gentleman will permit, right in line with his remarks I may say that I am satisfied that we in the Congress of the United States must get down to a proper understanding of the fundamentals which govern our economic relations, both foreign and domestic, if we are ever to solve our pressing problems. We must give less attention to details and be moved more by reason than by hysteria. If we master the fundamental principles governing our economic life, such details as unemployment will take care of themselves. They are the result of the lack of understanding of fundamentals.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I simply want to observe that the gentleman was reassured, was he not, that rural electrification had taken care of farm problems.

Mr. FADDIS. Of course, we all understand the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is very enthusiastic about rural electrification, and sometimes I wonder if his enthusiasm in that respect does not equal the enthusiasm of the ultra visionaries who wish to solve this problem by putting everyone who is unemployed on the public pay roll. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to solve this problem we must do as I stated before; we must make a thorough analysis of the capabilities of those who are unemployed. Those whose capabilities would permit them to be returned to a piece of land whereby they could earn part of their living should be returned to a piece of land. We must also return those who have capabilities along other lines to some form of employment whereby they can

take care of themselves, at least part of the time. We must work out some program which will take the unemployed from the dole and the W. P. A. and make them self-supporting citizens. I realize, and everyone else, I am sure, realizes, that when we undertake to put such a program as this into effect, we are going to run into objections from the organized farmers, and if we attempt to put some of these people into a sort of semiprivate industry whereby they can support themselves, we are going to run into trouble with organized labor.

So there will be two stumbling blocks in the road of any program of this kind, but if it is to be solved, if the unemployed are to be taken off the backs of the taxpayers of the United States, as they must be eventually, or the financial structure of this Nation will collapse, we will have to sit down and work out a program which will be mutually beneficial and agreeable to the taxpayers of the United States, to the farmers, and to the groups of organized labor of this Nation.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. HAWKS. Then will it not be one of the primary objects of Members of Congress to keep in mind the welfare of all of the people of the country rather than to run to cover every time one of these pressure groups starts working on us?

Mr. FADDIS. That is exactly true; and I believe right now that pressure groups are the most dangerous foes of democracy. They work only for their own selfish interests. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. I just want to say that the gentleman is sound and he has my deep sympathy because, as you know, you only have 20 on this side of the House who think the way you do. The gentleman understands that, does he not?

Mr. FADDIS. I know there are a great many on this side of the House that I could wish thought as I do. Perhaps, I am wrong, but I have always believed I am right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to say that so far as I am personally concerned, what I said here today is not the result of any activities of any pressure group at all, but simply represents my own thinking on the subject.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. I did not mean my statement as any reflection on the gentleman from California, because I have always felt he is speaking his own mind. I have never agreed with him on most of his philosophies; in fact, I am absolutely opposed to them, but there was no personal reflection upon the gentleman in the statement I made.

Mr. FADDIS. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin expresses the belief of every Member of the House in that respect. No one doubts the sincerity of the gentleman from California.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I plead today for less hysteria, less sentimentalism, and less selfishness in this question of unemployment. It is our primary national problem. It has been amply proven by 7 years' experience that it is permanent, not temporary, and must therefore have a permanent and not a temporary solution. Our experience has proven that W. P. A. is only a makeshift and no solution. We must get together and work it out on a common-sense basis, by making it possible for everyone to be self-supporting by means of the only method the world ever knew—production. We must work it out with the idea in mind of helping both the unemployed and the employed. We must work it out along the ideas of Americanism and not in response of the wishes of any or all of the many pressure groups in this Nation. We must function as statesmen, and when we do so we will find the answer. [Applause.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, the American people are determined now more than ever to abide by the wise advice given the Nation in the days of its infancy by its first President, the immortal George Washington. He warned us to beware of foreign alliances and entanglements. The present Congress is in complete agreement with that principle. I find an overwhelming sentiment against foreign involvements and alliances. I know I speak the sentiment of the vast majority of the Members of Congress when I say that the maintenance of peace is the cornerstone of our national policy. Unless called on to defend our country, this Nation will remain at peace. We are agreed that we will not enter into the quarrels of other nations. Yet we are all of one mind, that we will defend our shores, our lives, our liberties against foreign invasion.

We will not invite trouble to our land, but trouble may come without our making. Finland made every honorable attempt by peaceful means to avoid attack, but the Communist army marched against her. Poland was content to live within its borders at peace with the world, yet from the east and from the west it found itself invaded and crushed by the dictatorships—its liberties gone, its citizens condemned to lives of serfdom, its religion prostituted and destroyed. Czechoslovakia, a nation peopled by a proud and noble race, a nation desiring and asking nothing more than the opportunity to live its life in peaceful industry, found itself, too, taken over by a dictatorship.

We are living in a chaotic world. Who knows what the trend of events in Europe may be? Who can say the Communists will be content with their conquest of Finland and Poland? Without our people realizing what has been going on, the "red" dictator has been at work in our midst these many years. The Communist Party, professing Americanism, but accepting its orders and instructions from Moscow, has been boring from within. The Communists have entered the teaching role in our schools and colleges. Diligently the "red" agitator has been spreading his teachings of class hatred and strife.

In the words of a distinguished religious leader and citizen of Baltimore, the purpose of communism is not to keep the poor contented and happy but to create discontentment and to keep it steadily growing. The worst possible thing in the world for Communists is contentment. They breed on discontent.

The time has come in America for Americans to awake to what is going on about them. We who love freedom of opportunity, religious liberty, and political rights must realize that within and without there stand powerful forces that would destroy our American institutions. Little do some of us realize the insidious foreign influences and propaganda that are active all about us.

Everything that we have been taught from infancy to hold dear is held up to scorn, ridicule, and hatred. The family and the home, the Communist would destroy. Were the Soviet to succeed from without, or triumph by a successful revolution from within, Christianity would be banished from American life. The religions of our fathers—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—would meet the fate religion has met in Soviet Russia. The churches would be turned into halls for riotous living. The holy men and women of religious vocations would be violated and butchered.

Ours is the duty to make it plain to the foreign agitator that there is no place in America for him. If he does not like the American way, let him return to the place he came from. The foreign agitator can be curbed only if our people will exercise the eternal vigilance which is always the price of liberty.

To guard against the dangers from without is the task of the President and Congress. I am happy to say that Congress

is alive to its obligations. It realizes that the surest guaranty of security for America is an America adequately prepared to defend its liberties. No foreign nation will be likely to attack us if it realizes we are prepared to ward off attack.

Modern warfare is not a mere matter of calling up a citizens' army. It is not a matter of a month or two of preparation. Adequate defense means first a navy equal to any other navy in the world. I am happy to say the President and Congress have done and are doing nobly to create such a navy, one that in a short time will be the pride and joy and the security of every American.

Likewise, the army of modern warfare requires long training, an efficient officer personnel, modern equipment in tanks, guns, and shells. Such an army cannot spring into being overnight. Therefore, I am happy to tell you that the President and Congress are alive to the needs of the Army.

There is no hysterical preparation for war. Hysteria and scare, the Congress has carefully avoided. But it has set in motion the machinery that will give us the nucleus for a sufficient Army if we are called upon to defend ourselves.

The American air force a short time back was far inferior in numbers and equipment to the air forces of other nations. Here, too, we have realized our shortcoming. With great vigor we are creating an air force worthy of the greatness of America. Shortly our air force will be large enough to beat off any force that might be sent against us.

Adequate defense is the watchword. Let us build to the point required for our safety and security. For adequate defense we must build and build promptly.

The scientists, it has been said, measure space by the distances of stars; the dictators measure distances on this globe by the range of their bombing planes. Though America is determined to remain neutral and at peace with the world, it cannot close its eyes to what is going on about it. The only neutral that can feel safe in its desire for peace is the neutral that is ready and able to defend itself. The only plea for peace that the war-mad dictators will respect is a peace backed with battle for battle, bomber for bomber, tank for tank, gun for gun. This is the kind of preparedness that the American people are entitled to have. This is the kind of preparedness the President and Congress are now undertaking to provide for our peace-loving nation. It is our surest bulwark against war. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I also listened with great interest to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] who spoke a few moments ago. I rose once to question him, but saw that he had been so interrupted that he had too little time. I am taking just a moment now to express my firm belief that he is fundamentally right in the views he expressed. I might disagree with him in some detail, but not to any great extent. As I understood the gentleman from California, we cannot long continue to borrow from the rich to feed the poor, although his heart and mine are in sympathy with the mass of the poor who must be taken care of. There must be, and there is another way. Fundamentally we must revise not only our economic system, but our financial system, so as to do some long-range planning for this thing and not depend upon shots in the arm, these hypodermic injections which we have been using so frequently.

However, I do not condemn hypodermic injections absolutely, either financial or physical. A physician who goes into a hospital and says he will never resort to hypodermic injections, or to the use of drugs because his patient is apt to become addicted to the same, is making a sad mistake, and is showing inhumanity. There is, of course, danger of a patient becoming addicted to the use of drugs when he is carelessly treated for his health. So may our Nation, by these shots in the arm, lead some of our people to become addicted to help from the Government. We must watch out that we

do not pauperize our people. I fear that, and I want to avoid that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman feel that in justice to what has been done in the last few years it should be pointed out that the borrowing which the Government has done has been merely to compensate for the failure of private debt to be contracted during those years, which under our present monetary system is the means we depend upon to bring money into circulation.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. The gentleman is right; that is the way we have brought money into circulation and I feel there ought to be other means of bringing money into circulation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But that is the explanation of the Government's increase in debt.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. My understanding is that a capitalistic system of society where free enterprise is permitted—which is a system which we have and want to protect—requires borrowing. Therefore an interest-bearing debt is a characteristic feature of our economic society. Our national debt has now reached the point where we are beginning to feel concerned, but I am less concerned than some of my colleagues, when I think of the purpose for which this debt was created.

Textbooks on economics have long taught that it is the business of government to embark upon a spending and building program to furnish employment whenever the periodic depressions of the business cycle hit us, and private employment is reduced. If that was good economic doctrine in classical theory, why is not it good actual practice? And that, as I conceive it, is exactly what we have done.

The gentleman from California will recall that he and I listened 2 hours one evening recently to a distinguished scholar from Sweden who told us that his people believed in balancing the Budget, but that they had found out that it was not necessary to balance it annually. He said they were satisfied to balance it according to each business cycle. There is much food for thought there. I am in favor of our balancing the Budget according to business cycle rather than according to year.

Those who appear so desperately alarmed about our national indebtedness and fearful as to who will pay it and bear the interest burden might do well to consider that the total interest-bearing indebtedness for the country, public and private, is no greater now—indeed, it is less—than the total was in 1929. The difference is that there is now more Government borrowing and lending and less private lending than in 1929. Just so long as we have the American scheme of things, capital will be needed, borrowing will be necessary, and there must be an interest burden. Personally, I would prefer that most of the capital be furnished by private sources and the interest payments necessitated thereby go to private citizens. However, I should want that to be a natural and logical function of our economic and business system and not because of a monopolistic control by any special group. I do not believe that we ought to have a national debt, an interest-bearing debt, merely so some of our wealthy citizens can be coupon clippers.

Alexander Hamilton was of the school that believed a national debt is a national blessing. I can follow his reasoning. I can conceive that a national debt sometimes can be a national blessing, and believe it was in the early days of the Republic; but, on the other hand, I can conceive of a national debt—and we are approaching that situation now—being a menace. Perhaps we have just about reached the point where we do not want to go further into debt. Therefore, in order to help the country rather than to satisfy the desires of the lending class, we must seek some other way of financing that part of the program which the Government must necessarily carry on.

However, I am in agreement thoroughly with one or two remarks made just ahead of me—that it is our job now to find

employment for our unemployed in private industry. Really that is why I have asked for this time. A businessman said to me when I was home—and he is my banker, and a glass-eyed individual, at least he was glass-eyed on one or two occasions when I have visited him—that we ought to do something for the small-business man to help him be an employer; we have helped everybody else under heaven, and why not help the small-business man. I agree with him; and although this is not the chief explanation of what he thought ought to be done, I believe that a large part of the unemployment in the State of Arizona would vanish if mining could be resumed in the proper way. There is a great area highly mineralized; there is hidden wealth lying under the ground that ought to be taken out. There are 4,000 members of the small-mine operators in Arizona who have claims and who want to go to work, but these 4,000 small-mine operators have little or no capital. We have come to the aid of the railroads, the building trades, and the farmers, but we have done nothing for the development of mining, and there are about a dozen States in this country where mining is the basic industry. Mining is a hazardous venture, but is it more hazardous than fire, automobile, or marine insurance? Mining is one industry to which all other industries look for materials. Even farming is no more basically necessary than the taking of wealth from the earth, and yet no encouragement, aside from producing the precious metals, has been given our miners. To do two things at once, the Government could stimulate the mining industry and solve the unemployment problem.

Well, you say, "Why don't these mining men go to Wall Street and borrow, or why don't they go to Phoenix and borrow?" They cannot do so for several reasons. The one thing they need is to bring more capital into the mining industry. These men are entrepreneurs in the mining game, if you will allow that expression. These are private owners, and they want to get capital whereby they can go ahead and develop mines as they did 20 or 30 years ago. That is true not only in the State of Arizona, but it is true throughout the West. I believe that a wise policy on the part of this Government to aid such small-business men would give employment to thousands. That would be one of my suggestions.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I am interested in the gentleman's statement and I want to advance my thought in that connection. I said a moment ago that I believed we paid too little attention to fundamentals and too much attention to details. Now the gentleman is mentioning a problem in connection with the mining industry. Certainly the gentleman recognizes this fact, that in order to have an outlet for the products of those miners there must be a market?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Exactly. That is one of the essentials.

Mr. FADDIS. So the first thing we must do in this country is to restore confidence in the American institutions and in our time-honored economic system until it will produce a market for the products of the mine. Of all industries, mining is so dreadfully expensive labor that you must have a ready market for the products of the mine in order to produce them.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I may say to the gentleman that his State furnishes such a market, but I know one way to improve it. The gentleman will recall how strenuously he labored to get authorization and appropriation for a stock pile of the strategic minerals. His great objective was to lay in a supply of such as quickly as possible as an emergency proposition. The gentleman is aware that the great steel industry of Pennsylvania must have these same strategic minerals and metals, such as manganese and tungsten. The gentleman's State will serve as a ready market for all of these that we can produce. In safety for our country, the gentleman will admit we ought to develop the needed supply at home and not depend upon foreign sources.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FADDIS, Mr. VAN ZANDT, and Mr. PATRICK by unanimous consent were granted permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in thorough accord with the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]. It is encouraging to hear Members of the House, regardless of which side of the aisle they may represent, talk along such practical lines.

In the last 7 years we have spent \$22,108,454,024.98 for relief and recovery. I believe it is safe to say that we are no farther along today on the road to recovery than we were when the program was set up back in 1933. We cannot continue to carry this tremendous burden indefinitely. Already taxes have reached a point where they are acting as a brake on recovery and have lowered our living standard. Further unnecessary expenditures, of course, will be reflected in increasing those taxes and reducing the amount paid to the needy. Our aim should be to find a permanent cure for the unemployment that afflicts us at the present time. Today one out of every six and one-half persons is out of work and 6,000,000 of our youth have never had a steady job.

I have no sympathy with those who would have us believe that one-sixth of our people are on the relief rolls permanently. They do not want to stay on relief. They want jobs. I would rather take an optimistic view of it, that as yet we have but scratched the surface in our country's development. A large majority of those out of work would gladly take a job if it could be found. The thing that we need above everything else, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] so well pointed out, is to restore confidence on the part of those who are engaged in business and who have money to invest.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am in thorough agreement with the gentleman's statement. Would the gentleman desire to express his views briefly on the inducement for capital to invest in productive enterprise through a decrease of the higher surtaxes that we have on our income taxes?

Mr. KNUTSON. Leading economists are of the opinion that our present surtax rates have already passed beyond the point of diminishing returns. In other words, they believe we could get more revenue with modified rates. This view has been held by former Secretaries of the Treasury, and Democrats as well as Republicans. I am inclined to agree with them because, after all, excessive taxation tends to create stagnation and unemployment. On that subject let me quote President Roosevelt in his Pittsburgh address on October 19, 1932:

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and, hence, in hordes of the hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

No longer does the cry "soak the rich" have any appeal for the thinking man and woman because they know the rich are being taxed to the limit at the present time. The highest income brackets are taxed 79 percent by the Federal Government, which leaves them 21 percent for living expenses, replacement, expansion, and State and local taxes. How long can a program like that stand up without breaking down? It is time that we take a rational and common-sense view of this whole question. The demagogue has been ranting long enough.

The time has come for us to lay aside partisanship in the consideration of this great question. I want to believe, and I

do believe, that those who are now charged with the administration of relief in this country are doing the best that they can. They are acting according to their light, but it would seem that by this time it should be apparent to all that no lasting benefit has accrued from what has already been done, and that it would be futile to expect any benefit of a permanent nature can be derived from the present program in the future.

If I were conducting the relief policy of this Government, I would acquire farms on the outskirts of centers of population, and, instead of putting one family on 160 acres, I would divide that farm up into 30 or 40 small tracts, put a set of buildings on each tract costing \$3,000 or \$4,000. I would not expect the people that we placed on those tracts to derive their entire income and support from the homestead, but at least it would be a refuge in times of unemployment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is always seasonal work to be had in centers of population. If we could provide those people who are now on relief, or the greater part of them, with a small tract of land that they could work by hand, where a team would not be required, where they could have a cow, a pig or two, a few chickens, and raise their own potatoes and other garden truck—with what they could earn on the side in seasonal work would make them absolutely independent, and that is what they want.

The \$22,000,000,000 we have spent on relief and recovery would have provided \$6,316 for each of the three and one-half million families on relief. How much of that amount has each family received? We all know that relief has been necessary and will continue to be until we can find jobs for the unemployed, but too much of the relief dollar has gone for administration and too little of it got down where it was needed. Those who have opposed the excessively high administrative cost of relief are called heartless reactionaries who would let the people go hungry. My friends, that is not true.

There is a very considerable element in this country who do not want to see the relief problem solved. They aim to keep that large number under their thumb politically. Then, there are those who have organized large groups of relievers and make an easy living out of contributions received from people who can ill afford to spend money for that purpose. It is a sad and sordid picture and one that we will not be proud to look back upon when times again become normal.

Relief will have to be continued until industrial production can be speeded up to a point where the unemployed can be absorbed. Unfortunately, the present policy is preventing the speeding up of production, except in a few industries that supply war material.

The charge that Congress has been niggardly in appropriating for relief is not borne out by facts. Such appropriations would have been all-sufficient had they been wisely expended. If it has been found necessary to lay off relief workers the blame must be laid at the door of those who have been charged with spending the money. They have wasted the money we gave them. On all sides we find examples of wasteful spending for needless projects. Congress is not altogether blameless for this sad state of affairs but, primarily, the major blame must be placed on the shoulders of those who failed to grasp the fact that every dollar wasted came out of the pockets of those who are in dire need. Let them explain what has been done with the money we have appropriated for relief and recovery since 1933. The total represents \$22 for every minute since the time of Christ, or \$22,108,454,024.98, an astronomical figure, and yet there are those who say it should have been much greater.

If we would take our foot off the brake that is holding the machine back while we are climbing a steep grade—and

it is the first time in history that we have seen anyone do that in climbing a steep grade—if we would take our foot off the brake, reduce Government spending to actual needs, reduce expenditures in such a way that it will be reflected in a substantial reduction in taxes, which in turn will inspire confidence and provide work for those unemployed but are employable. That would end the depression.

You cannot make me believe that we have reached full development of our country. When I was in Europe last summer I found there was an actual manpower shortage in Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. The only country where there was an unemployment problem of any magnitude was in Great Britain. We should not have that problem on our hands. Instead of lagging back way down the list in recovery we should be way out in front in recovery, with our great resources, our untapped wealth.

Today we are No. 20 in point of recovery. We should be No. 1. We should be leading the whole world on the road back to normal times. But we cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, until we have reduced taxes, until we have taken the Government's strangling hand off of the throat of industry, and until we give some assurance that the man who has the courage to invest his money is going to get a fair return on his investment. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, frequently we are getting excited up here when we drift into partisanship, something which has not shown itself today, there has been no partisanship shown here, and it is a refreshing thing. Here is what we are in this country, and I think as lawmakers we might as well just relax and think it out. We Americans are a bunch of people who landed in a country of tremendous resources, the like of which had not been enjoyed by any other people in any other part of the world. This is a storehouse of earth's richest treasure. This is the lap of Croesus here. So, as a people, what did we do? We became naturally a bunch of cold, sotted wastrels. We had so much we did not know what to do with it. We cut down our forests. If trees died by worms, by fire, or general waste we could go across the hollow to find and cut more. There were plenty. We killed off our bison, we recklessly and carelessly plowed our lands. If we plowed it up and down hill and it washed away we could move to another hundred acres across the valley. It could be obtained by mere entry. Not only have we done that with our timber, wild game, and our grasslands, but also with most of our natural resources, and we bolted into the same sort of growth as to our general economic structure. It may be a bit harder to visualize but is as certain a fact.

We now have come to the place where there are 130,000,000 people in this country, and the things that we have enjoyed by reason of natural abundance we find are becoming exhausted. Even our old methods of economics cannot be sustained. The Democrats have been blaming the Republicans and the Republicans blaming the Democrats when as a matter of fact it is just a condition wherein we have caught up with ourselves; we have taken up all the slack and we might just as well blame nobody as anybody else, but have the common sense to get together to figure it out and decide what we had better do, for it we do not learn to operate on a different basis than we have in the past poverty is assured the generation that is to come. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOLVING OUR NATIONAL PROBLEMS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I take it that every Member of Congress is interested in restoring normal conditions throughout the country. The question is how to arrive at that solution.

For us to admit in the very infancy, you might say, of this Republic, with all our great natural resources, for us to admit that we are unable to solve these problems certainly would be a confession that would be deadening to the aspirations of the American people.

My contention is that we have the solution in our hands and that it is the duty of Congress to solve these problems. You are not going to do it, however, by borrowing money from the rich and giving it to the poor for all of us to pay back with compound interest, in that way holding down commodity prices, depressing prices, and stultifying human initiative.

I believe in a free economy. The only attack that I have made on private enterprise has been against those monopolies that violate every fundamental principle of the common law. The only time I have ever advocated public ownership was a public ownership of public utilities where they were engaged in a public business, such as the electric power business.

In my opinion, that is the only way we are ever going to solve the problem we have today of these enormous holding companies that impose upon the masses of the American people the exorbitant overcharges that we are now having to pay for electric lights and power.

I have tried to secure for the American people relief from these exorbitant overcharges for electric energy, and I have the happy consolation of knowing that my efforts in that respect have helped to reduce light and power rates in every State in the American Union and in every congressional district represented on this floor. Practically every human being who turns an electric switch anywhere in the United States has benefited by my efforts.

Here we are in the richest land the world has ever seen. We have more wheat, more corn, more cotton, more lumber, and more manufactured articles than we know what to do with. The contention is made that we have a surplus—that we have too much. Yet hungry people are appealing to us on every hand. We try to solve the problem, as I said, by borrowing from the rich and giving to the poor, which is one of the most deflationary programs I have ever known. Agriculture has been regimented, the farmer has been put in a strait jacket and told how much he shall plant, what he shall plant, and what he shall do with it, contrary to all those fundamental principles of the common law on which human freedom and free institutions have been built. We have gathered up the gold of the world, demonetized it, and buried it in the ground. We have demonetized silver. The ones from whom we bought much of this gold have taken the money we paid for it back to countries that have depreciated their currencies and have bought three, four, or five times as much goods with it as they could have bought with the same amount of money in this country.

Under the Federal Reserve Act we have a right to issue currency with a 40-percent gold coverage. This \$18,000,000,000 of gold we have buried in the ground would supply a reserve for a sufficient amount of currency to pay the national debt.

Where is our foreign market? It is not in Europe today. We have demonetized silver, as I said a moment ago. When we demonetized silver we killed our foreign markets in the Orient. Silver has been the money of all the Orient since the beginning of time. The first money ever mentioned in Holy Writ was silver. That is the only money the people in the Orient know. That is the only money they can get. When we demonetized silver we killed our foreign trade in the oriental countries. Today our foreign trade is dead; it has come to a standstill; high tariffs and other trade restrictions have killed our European trade, and our silver policy has almost destroyed our oriental trade.

The industrialists are today charging the same prices for their industrial commodities that they were receiving at the peak of agricultural high prices. The farmers are paying the

same prices for manufactured articles today that they were paying when cotton was 20 cents or 25 cents a pound and when wheat was \$2 or \$2.50 a bushel. Our farmers cannot stand it. It is gradually grinding them into the dust. We never will solve this problem until we solve the monetary question—put this gold and silver to work, or put its representative, the currency issued against it, to work, and in that way restore the prices of farm products. Members from industrial centers will say, "You would just raise prices to all." But that would not raise the debt these farmers owe; it would not raise the taxes these farmers have to pay; it would not increase the interests on those debts. But it would increase the farmer's income and give him something to buy with.

You talk about income taxes. The farmers of this Nation, the home owners of this Nation out in the rural sections, pay the highest taxes for the incomes they receive of anybody under the American flag. When you depressed those prices from 20-cent cotton and \$2 wheat to 10-cent cotton and \$1 wheat, or 8-cent cotton and 80-cent wheat, you simply double the burden he has of paying his taxes, his interest, and the debt against his farm. That is the reason that the onward march of farm foreclosures has continued during the time we have spent these billions of dollars trying to restore prosperity in an illogical way.

A while ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] said that these people would not go back to the farms, and he drew, very graphically, the picture of the old conditions back on the farm, of drudgery, monotony, silence, no conveniences, the drab life of the farmer of 30 years ago. In the last few years I have waged a successful fight here for rural electrification in this country. I have waged a battle to get electricity to the farmers at rates they can afford to pay, and in my own area I have succeeded.

In other sections of the country we are not only extending the lines, but we are gradually bringing those rates down. If the farmer can get cheap electricity, and he will get it before we quit—if he can have the conveniences you have in the city, the radio, lights, washing machine, water pump, vacuum cleaner, refrigerator, electric range, and electric heat for his house, he would rather live out there.

You notice almost every Congressman who has spoken here today has said that he comes from the farm. If they had the same conveniences out there that they have in the cities, he would never have left the farm. That is the condition we are trying to create. The greatest movement that has ever been instituted to bring about that condition has been rural electrification—taking electricity to the farms of this Nation at rates based upon the cost of the generation, transmission, and distribution.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PATRICK. I was in the gentleman's area 10 years ago and I have been there recently. I can testify to what he states. Will the gentleman please tell this body the number of people who had lights and modern conveniences in his district 10 years ago compared with today?

Mr. RANKIN. As far as the farmers in my section are concerned, 10 years ago the private power company had one little line that I know of. The company charged them \$3.25 a month for line charges and then charged them so much a kilowatt-hour for their electricity. The use of 25 kilowatt-hours of electricity a month in those days cost a farmer on this line \$4.50. It now costs him \$1 a month under the T. V. A. rates, and 25 cents of that dollar goes to amortize his line. When the line is paid out, then the rates will be further reduced.

You cannot stop this movement toward cheap electricity. The American people have had a taste of it, and the ones who are not tasting it are tasting the bitter fruits of the overcharges they have to pay. They are going to demand lower rates, and by the time another election comes around the rest of you Congressmen will be just as enthusiastic as I am about bringing the rates for electricity down to where the people can pay them.

But that is not the only thing necessary to restore prosperity. I read speeches every day of candidates for the office of President of the United States. Unfortunately some of them are Members of the United States Senate and I cannot criticize a Senator on the floor of the House. However, those speeches sound like the fulminations of school boys as far as touching the great problems with which we have to deal is concerned. They never propose to even attempt to wipe out the disparity between agriculture and industry the tariff has produced. They never make a stab, even, at wiping out the freight rate discriminations that have been bleeding the farmers of the South, the West, and the Middle West for a quarter of a century, shipping uphill, if you please, paying through the nose the overcharges for freight rates. They never attempt to speak on the money question. They avoid this money question for fear they might offend some of the money barons of the Nation. They seem to overlook the fact that we are now in a death grapple with the favored few who have made their fortunes out of the prosperity of the past, whether it was the artificial prosperity of the war or not. These few have made their fortunes and now have their money invested in tax-exempt securities, and many of them live off incomes to which they have never contributed.

Many of them have not earned a dollar of their vast fortunes for three generations, and yet they strive to hold prices down in order that the values of their holdings may be held up. Of these men who are out running for President, not a single one has dared to tell you what he would do with this great wealth of gold we have buried in Kentucky. Oh, for a William J. Bryan, oh, for a William E. Borah on your side, to go to the American people and arouse them to a realization of the fact that we never will cure the conditions with which we are now confronted unless this policy is changed, and that if we follow the policy advocated by these Republican candidates for President the conditions will grow infinitely worse.

What we need today is men who understand this monetary question, men who understand the great economic questions of the day, men who do not have their minds buried in the cesspools of Europe, men who are not itching to get us into a World War, but who are determined to keep us out of the present conflict, men who are interested in the restoration of prosperity for our country, in the prosperity and welfare of the American people now and for generations to come. Through such a policy we can solve the great questions that now confront the Nation, by stimulating and encouraging free enterprise, restoring the farmer's prosperity, and making it possible for him to purchase industrial commodities. That would start the wheels of industry and give work for the unemployed. In that way we can bring back prosperity for all, we can take our people off the relief rolls, we can start the wheels of industry moving, restore prosperity to the farmers of the Nation, and pass this Republic down to the generations to come—a rich and prosperous Nation—the outstanding and unchallenged leader of all the great countries of the world. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RABAUT, indefinitely, on account of sickness at home.

To Mr. McLAUGHLIN, for 2 weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. BURGIN (at the request of Mr. BULWINKLE), for 14 legislative days, on account of illness.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 200. Joint resolution to provide for participation of the United States in the Golden Gate International Exposition at San Francisco in 1940, to continue the powers and duties of the United States Golden Gate International Exposition Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

Tuesday, April 2, 1940:

H. R. 7169, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish additional boards of local inspectors in the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation.

Tuesday, April 9, 1940:

H. R. 7637, relative to liability of vessels in collision.

Tuesday, April 16, 1940:

H. R. 8475, to define "American fishery."

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Insular Affairs on Monday, April 15, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the continued consideration of H. R. 8239, creating the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, April 3, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of private bills and unfinished business.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Tuesday, April 2, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 3648.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Indian Affairs on Wednesday next, April 3, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 3047, H. R. 3048, H. R. 5674, and H. R. 5918.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On April 3, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., there will be continued before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary a hearing on the bill (H. R. 7534) to amend an act to prevent pernicious political activity (to forbid the requirement that poll taxes be paid as a prerequisite for voting at certain elections). The hearings will be held in room 346, House Office Building, and will be continued on the following dates, April 9 and April 10, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1940 BEGINNING APRIL 1, 1940, AT 10 A. M. DAILY

The hearings will be on reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, and on amendments to existing law. The committee plans to report an omnibus bill with authorizations of approximately one hundred and fifty to one hundred and seventy-five million dollars, covering the principal regions of the country.

Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, the president of the Mississippi River Commission, the assistants to the Chief of Engineers, the division engineers, and the district engineers will be requested to submit additional statements as individual projects are considered and as desired by the committee.

1. Monday, April 1: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects on the White River and tributaries.

2. Tuesday, April 2: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in report on rivers in Texas and the Southwest.

3. Wednesday, April 3: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in the Los Angeles area and in the Pacific Northwest.

4. Thursday, April 4: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for projects in Colorado and other western areas.

5. Friday, April 5: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for the lower Mississippi River and other tributaries.

6. Saturday, April 6: Sponsors and representatives of the Corps of Engineers for other drainage-basin areas for other projects in other parts of the country.

7. Monday, April 8: Representatives from the Department of Agriculture and other governmental agencies.

8. Tuesday, April 9: Senators and Members of Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1496. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America (H. Doc. No. 680); to the Committee on Education and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1497. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of seven items from the Government Printing Office to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1498. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of two items from the Work Projects Administration which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1499. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 30 items from the Works Progress Administration which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1500. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 86 items from the Federal Security Agency which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1501. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of one item from the Department of Labor which is to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1502. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 10 items from the Department of Labor which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1503. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 21 items from the Department of Labor which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1504. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 17 items from the Department of Commerce which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1505. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 26 items from the Department of Agriculture which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1506. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 28 items from the Department of the Interior which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1507. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 362 items from the

Post Office Department which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1508. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of photographic films from the Department of the Navy which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1509. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of two items from the records of the United States attorney at Brooklyn, N. Y., which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1510. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of six items from the Department of War which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1511. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 70 items from the Department of the Treasury which are to be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1512. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to eliminate the oaths required of masters of vessels and shippers of cargo in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1513. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence and Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1514. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Tygart River and tributaries in the vicinity of Elkins, W. Va., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8937. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the relief of ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed needy American Indians through the utilization of surplus American agricultural and other commodities; with amendment (Rept. No. 1903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Naval Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8659) to clear the name of Burney Peters, and the same was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DE ROUEN:

H. R. 9171. A bill to withdraw certain portions of land within the Hawaii National Park and to transfer the same to the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of War for military purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 9172. A bill to forbid the appointment of any person but a resident of the Territory of Alaska to the office of Governor of said Territory; to the Committee on the Territories.

H. R. 9173. A bill for the protection of the water supply of the town of Petersburg, Alaska; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 9174. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. SCHULTE:

H. R. 9175. A bill to provide for a full-time judge to try traffic offenses in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 9176. A bill to provide necessary funds for the Work Projects Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 9177. A bill to establish equitable and uniform rates of compensation and hours of labor for civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Res. 450. Resolution providing for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the German White Book; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 9178. A bill for the relief of Mary Keegan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri:

H. R. 9179. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Meister; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 9180. A bill for the relief of the estate of Max Adams Shepard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEYER of California:

H. R. 9181. A bill to authorize cancellation of deportation in the case of A. W. Eichel; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 9182. A bill directing the Secretary of War to issue Army discharge to George James Everett, who was regularly inducted into the military service of the United States prior to November 11, 1918, and was discharged from draft on June 13, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 9183. A bill granting a pension to Alice Chumbley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 9184 (by request). A bill for the relief of Arthur Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7264. By Mr. HART: Petition of the mayor and Council of the Borough of Pompton Lakes, N. J., favoring and desiring the adoption of a plan of flood control for the Passaic River Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

7265. Also, petition of the Council of the Town of Kearny, N. J., favoring and desiring the adoption of a plan of flood control for the Passaic River Valley; to the Committee on Flood Control.

7266. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, requesting that legislation be enacted to reimburse the Passaic Valley sewerage commissioners for damages occasioned to the outfall pipes of the Passaic Valley trunk sewer in New York Harbor by the steamship *Leviathan*, which was owned and operated by the United States of America; to the Committee on Claims.

7267. By Mr. JOHNS: Petition of Maurice Schur and 23 others of Kaukauna, Wis., asking Members of Congress to give vigorous support to the Patman chain-store tax bill, H. R. 1.

that it may be speedily enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7268. Also, petition of Frank Verhagen and 16 others, of Kimberly, Wis., asking Members of Congress to give vigorous support to the Patman chain-store tax bill (H. R. 1), that it may be speedily enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7269. Also, petition of Edw. C. Keller and 64 others, of Appleton, Wis., asking Members of Congress to give vigorous support to the Patman chain-store tax bill (H. R. 1), that it may be speedily enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7270. Also, petition of Edmund St. Clair and 184 others, of Green Bay; Carl Jannesen and 17 others, of De Pere; and 87 others from Manitowoc, Kewaunee, Door, Outagamie, Brown, Marinette, Oconto, Florence, and Forest Counties, all of the State of Wisconsin, urging and requesting their Representative in Congress to use his best efforts to secure the passage of the Patman chain-store bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7271. Also, petition of Merton Snow and 11 others, asking support of Senate bill 1610, House Calendar 184; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7272. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the New York Post Office Clerks Association, station K post office, New York City, favoring longevity pay bills now pending before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7273. By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Petition of racing homing pigeon fanciers and friends, supporting House bill 7813; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7274. By Mr. O'NEAL: Petition of various citizens of Louisville, Ky., in behalf of House bill 5620; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7275. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of S. Rankin Drew Unit 340, American Legion Auxiliary, New York City, concerning House bills 8390 and 9000; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7276. Also, petition of the New York Post Office Clerks Association, Inc., New York City, urging favorable consideration and passage of the longevity pay bills; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

7277. By Mr. SWEENEY: Petition of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America, S. W. O. C., Harrison Lodge, No. 1020, Cleveland, Ohio, concerning violations of National Labor Relations Act by Republic Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel, and Weirton Steel, and petitioning the Members of Congress to pass House bill 3331; to the Committee on Labor.

7278. Also, petition of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America, S. W. O. C., Harrison Lodge, No. 1020, Cleveland, Ohio, concerning the Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Act, and petitioning the Members of Congress to pass House bill 3331; to the Committee on Labor.

7279. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, Local 184, opposing antialien legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7280. Also, petition of the National Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Champaign, Ill., supporting Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7281. Also, petition of the United Electrical Machine Workers of America, Fort Wayne, Ind., supporting Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7282. Also, petition of Local U. E. R. M. W. A., supporting Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7283. Also, petition of the Federation of Architects, Chemists, and Engineers of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, supporting the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Labor.

7284. Also, petition of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, favoring the continued cooperation with the housing committee of the American Federation of Labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7285. Also, resolution of the Electrical Workers Local, No. 595, supporting Senate bill 591; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7286. By Mr. HARRINGTON: Petition of the Sioux City National Farm Loan Association, of Sioux City, Iowa, regarding Government loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7287. Also, petition of the National Farm Loan Associations of Danbury, Iowa, regarding Government loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, March 4, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Duncan Fraser, assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance; and from every evil way. Defend our liberties and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues, that we may be an acceptable nation in Thy sight. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 1, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolutions of the Senate:

S. 2689. An act to amend section 33 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, and for other purposes;

S. 2977. An act authorizing the construction and maintenance of a dike or dam across Stansbury Creek in Baltimore County, Md.;

S. 3209. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pearl River at or near Carthage, in the State of Mississippi;

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution to approve the action of the Secretary of the Interior in deferring the collection of certain irrigation charges against lands under the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project; and

S. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 607) to amend section 40 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1790. An act to authorize additions to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., through exchanges under the act of March 20, 1922, or by proclamation or Executive order;

H. R. 6957. An act to extend to the Colville Indian Reservation in the State of Washington the provisions of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984), as amended;

H. R. 7074. An act to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain

disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments;

H. R. 7406. An act granting the consent of Congress to the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Middletown, Pa.;

H. R. 7407. An act granting the consent of Congress to the General State Authority, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and/or the Pennsylvania Bridge and Tunnel Commission, either singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near the city of Millersburg, Pa.;

H. R. 7530. An act to transfer the site and buildings of the Tomah Indian School to the State of Wisconsin;

H. R. 7655. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River between the village of Barryville, N. Y., and the village of Shohola, Pa.;

H. R. 7736. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title;

H. R. 7833. An act to set aside certain lands for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7989. An act to legalize a bridge across the Nestucca River at Pacific City, Oreg.;

H. R. 8285. An act to limit the importation of articles, products, and minerals produced, processed, or mined under process covered by outstanding United States patents; to define unfair trade practices in certain instances, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8320. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River near Jefferson Barracks, Mo.;

H. R. 8356. An act for the exchange of lands adjacent to the San Juan National Forest and the Rio Grande National Forest in Colorado;

H. R. 8372. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, Ill.;

H. R. 8423. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard," approved January 12, 1938;

H. R. 8467. An act authorizing the Superior Oil Co., a California corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge or causeway, and approaches thereto, across the old channel of the Wabash River from Cut-Off Island, Posey County, Ind., to White County, Ill.;

H. R. 8476. An act to adjust the boundaries of the Cedar Breaks National Monument and the Dixie National Forest, in the State of Utah, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8498. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the payment of the costs of repairs, resurfacing, improvement, and enlargement of the Arrowrock Dam in 20 annual installments, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8669. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 8916. An act to reimpose the trust on certain lands allotted to Indians of the Crow Tribe, Montana;

H. R. 9047. An act to provide for the transfer of United States prisoners in certain cases; and

H. J. Res. 400. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1940, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Barbour	Brown	Chandler
Ashurst	Barkley	Bulow	Chavez
Austin	Bilbo	Byrnes	Clark, Idaho
Bailey	Bone	Capper	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Bridges	Caraway	Connally